Minutes of Meeting of Fishery Advisory Board held on Thursday, 27th November, 1913, at its Office, Customs Department, Adderley Street.

Present: Dr. Gilchrist; messrs Reenaman, Daneel & Aling

1. Minutes of previous meeting and of the Inquiry in regard to the "Protection of Crawfish" were confirmed.

2. Suggested extension of open trout season.

In reply to a further enquiry from the Provincial Secretary, it was decided to inform him that there appeared to be no reason why the open season for trout should not be of longer duration than at present, and that the months of April and May were recommended in this connection as the rivers are then running well. The latter part of January, and the months of February and March were undesirable as rivers are low and, in addition, an open season then might lead to poaching. The approach of spawning season at end of May demands a further close season, and this should be from commencement of June to end of September. There appears no reason for making any alteration in open season for trout in vleis.

3. Klein Slang Kop Fishing Station: improvements to. Letter from Provincial Secretary.

Ordered to be recorded.

4. Sub-Committee's Report on "Protection of Crawfish".

The Report, of which a copy is annexed, was adopted.

The Secretary was instructed to inform the Provincial Secretary that consequent to the Inquiry on the question of the protection of crawfish, the Board arrived at certain conclusions which it was now anxious to place before the representatives of the crawfish factories and other witnesses who gave evidence in order to ascertain their views thereon, and for this purpose would be glad if a general meeting of such witnesses could take place at the Board's Office on, say, Wednesday week.

The Provincial Secretary was further to be advised that the Board was desirous of embodying in its report a statement showing when the various factories were established and also the number of crawfish caught annually by each factory since its establishment, which information the Board suggests should be obtained from the factories as early as possible. The names of factories that are being opened or will be opened in the near future are also required.

J.W.Munnik,

Secretary to Fishery Advisory Board.

Confirmed.

J D F Gilchrist

Chairman. 23/1/14

Protection of Crawfish.

(Letter proposed to be sent to the Provincial Secretary. A meeting, however, will first take place with the representatives of the Crawfish Factories, etc., when the proposals herein embodied will be explained to them).

In response to your letter of the 20th September last, No. A 130 e., having regard to certain representations which the Board had made to you in the matter of the Crawfish Industry and the possible dangers of diminution or extermination to which it was exposed by reason of the absence of proper and adequate control of the methods in vogue in conducting and carrying on the Industry, and in view thereof requesting the Board to hold a public investigation into:-

(1) Proposed Close Season.
(2) Size Limit.
(3) Protection of Females.

and further to advise on the sections of Coast Line applicable to a Close Season and varying as to the suitable dates for such section, I have the honour to submit the result of the Inquiry which was held on the 24th October, and 7 and 14th November.

In all, seventeen persons connected with or employed in the Industry volunteered or were called upon to give evidence: eleven of these represented Canning Factories and six were Native and Italian Fishermen.

Development of Industry:

Dr Gilchrist, Marine Biologist, has recently issued a most interesting and exhaustive report in connection with his investigations, which the Board recommends to the careful study of those interested in the Industry. Until 1874, crawfish were merely caught for a very limited local consumption and for bait. In that year the potentialities of the Crawfish as an industry were realized and attempts were made to establish a Canning business. The project was attended with poor results and abandoned, and it was not until 1890 when a further attempt was made; but owing to difficulties and, it may be, a want of knowledge of the proper methods of preserving the fish the project again failed. From this time other attempts have been made with varying success but the Industry may claim to have been fairly established in 1902.

The following particulars in regard to the Canning Companies may be interesting:-

Name.	Address.	When established.	Approximate output.
South Atlantic Lobster Syndicate.	Woodstock.		
[illegible]	[illegible].		
The Cape Canning Co.	Mouille Point.		
Hout Bay Canning Co.	Hout Bay.	31st July, 1905.	
(The originators of the above three Companies were Messrs Plessis and Strasburger).			
Hickson & Sons.	Woodstock.	1884.	50 cases of 96 ½ lb. tins per day.
North Bay Canning Co.	Noetjes Bay.	1902.	40,000 cases (96 ½ lb. tins per case).

North

Name:	Address.	When established.	Approximate output.
North Bay Canning Co.	Steenberg's Cove Saldanha Bay. (Factory closed in 1910 for repairs).	1908.	1909, 4311 cases. 1910, nil. 1911, 5085 cases. 1912, 10,305 cases.
Saldanha Bay Canning Co.	Hoetjes Bay.	April, 1909.	5,500 cases.
J. Ovenstone.	Woodstock.	1909.	1910, 85,500 crawfish. 1911, 1,854,650 "
Table Bay Canning Co.	Cape Town.	Sept., 1911.	1912, 4,000 cases.
Cape Town Canning Co.	Woodstock.		

This rapid development and extension of the Industry very naturally gave occasion to the fear that the fishing was being overdone and that in course of time the supply might be exhausted, such as occurred to the Lobster Industry in America. As to whether this fear is justified is the real object of this Inquiry and the Board, as the result of their investigations, and other sources has come to the conclusion that there is grave reasons to fear that unless precautions are taken to protect the Industry there may be a great diminution in the supply.

The evidence taken was unanimous as to the urgent necessity for additional restrictions. The representatives of some of the existing Canneries were not prepared to admit that there was any diminution at present in the supply: on the contrary, it was said that at certain times of the year the supply was inexhaustible, but it was admitted by some of the witnesses that it was necessary to go further afield for the catch, and all were of opinion that with the present increase in the number of boats and men employed, a diminution in the supply might be anticipated. It was also stated that a diminution in the size had been observed in Table Bay and that the fish were scarcer inshore at St Helena Bay.

The native fishermen, on the other hand, state emphatically that there is a very marked falling off in the supply, and gave instances where crawfish were once abundant and are not now to be found.

As an instance of the possible drain on the supply it was stated in evidence that each Factory would absorb, when fully working, at least 1,000,000 fish per annum, and it is anticipated that in a few months' time there will be twelve Factories at work, which means a total output by Factories alone of twelve millions Crawfish every year. This quantity in itself is not alarming as the supply is enormous, but in view of further extension the Board considers that precautions are absolutely necessary to protect the Industry.

Close Season.

The close season at present in vogue corresponds with the time during which the fish migrate to deeper water and cast their shell and are therefore not obtainable: this time seems to differ in various sections of the Coast, and consequently there should not be a uniform time for the close season. An opinion was expressed by some of the witnesses that there should be an additional close season between 15th May and 15th June as the fish caught at that time are mostly female and small fish, but, pending further information, the

Board is not prepared to make any recommendation on this point

The Board is of opinion that whilst the close season may not afford sufficient protection, it should be retained, and that ~~minimum~~ four months' close season recommended on a previous occasion be adhered to. The following is proposed:-

Hout Bay District (Cape Point to Duiker Point): September 15th to January 15th.

Table Bay District (Duiker Point to - but not including - Dassen Island): October 15th to February 15th.

Saldanha Bay District (Dassen Island to Jacob's Rock): November 15th to March 15th.

St Helena Bay District (Jacob's Rock to Orange River): December 15th to April 15th.

Size Limit.

The opinion is unanimous that the present size limit (three inches from base of eyestalk to end of carapace) is too small. The following sizes have been proposed:- 3¾, 4, and 4½. The Board recommends that the size limit should be at least 4 inches, measured from the rostrum, or middle anterior spine, to the end of the carapace. This would represent about 5 and 5/9ths inches according to the old measurement.

Protection of female in berry.

The Board is of opinion that no females in berry should be allowed to be taken.

Supervision.

The Board is of opinion that, in view of the importand dimensions which the Industry has already assumed and the development already in sight, the Government should exercise a strict supervision as to the manner in which the business is conducted, more especially in regard to sanitation and the quality of the fish at time of canning. There is evidence that the Industry has already suffered from defective canning, and the success of the Industry on a whole might be seriously affected by one or two bad shipments, and the Board recommends that the Factories should be licensed and that investigations should be made with the object of ensuring the canning of sound products only.

Alleged variations in seasons, etc.

The Board would also direct attention to the necessity of carrying out further investigations into such questions as the alleged variation of seasons at different localities on the coast, the migration of crawfish from one part to another, and the feasibility of artificial hatching. Much more information is required on these points in order to safeguard the industry, and the accompanying recommendations of the Board are in a measure tentative. The operations of the present and future factories should be carefully noted.

Catching of crawfish for bait.

The question of allowing crawfish to be caught for bait has engaged the serious attention of the Board. It would appear that the Table Bay fishermen would suffer severely if forbidden to capture crawfish for this purpose, and that at certain seasons they can get nothing but female crawfish. The Board is satisfied that the close season should not apply to crawfish

caught

caught for bait. If the fact be established that only berried females are procurable for bait at certain times, and alleged by fishermen, due consideration should be given to this, stringent precautions being taken that any such privileges are not abused.

Finally, there appears to be an urgent necessity for the enforcement of regulations, as they seem to have been hitherto more or less a dead letter.

(196)

Minutes of Meeting of Fishery Advisory Board held on Friday, the 23rd January, 1914.

Present: Dr Gilchrist, and Messrs Runciman, Daneel, &Aling,

1. Minutes of previous Meetings were confirmed.

2. Protection of Crawfish.

Dr Gilchrist read certain correspondence received from Messrs Stephan Bros; J. Wilsnach & 90 others, in which objection was made to the crawfish seasons proposed by the Board for area Duiker Point to Orange River.

Mr Irvin stated that Messrs Hinchliffe & Holland were of the same opinion.

After discussion, it was decided to amend the recommendations as follows:-

(1) Duiker Point to Cape Columbine: 15th October to 15th February.

(2) Cape Columbine to Orange River: 15th November to 15th March.

3. Letters from Provincial Secretary:-

(a) Erection of Fish Curing Shed at Port Elizabeth.
Matter should be referred to the Municipality under whose sphere it would come.

NOTED.

(b) Disappearance of fish from tidal rivers of Eastern Province: letter to Mr Dolly.
Mr Dolly informed that from data available impossible to arrive at definite conclusion re imposition of close season. Further, cannot at present arrange for special local investigation which would necessarily occupy considerable time. Suggest Sporting Clubs and similar angling associations keep record of all catches with object of clearing up points now open to much discussion.

NOTED.

(c) W.W.Thompson's "Sea Fisheries of Cape Colony".
Not prepared to authorise purchase of further copies of this work.

NOTED.

(d) Hout Bay: regulations re dimensions of trek nets and hauling lines.
Withdrawal of existing regulations on the above matter.

NOTED.

J.W.Munnik,

Secretary to Fishery Advisory Board.

Confirmed.

J D F Gilchrist

Chairman,
6th March, 1914.

Minutes of Meeting of Fishery Advisory Board held on Friday, the 6th.March, 1914.

Present : Dr. Gilchrist and Messrs. Daneel, Irvin, Aling and Cripps (Fishery Officer.)

1. The Minutes of previous meeting were confirmed.

2. Estimates 1914-1915.

Dr. Gilchrist stated that in accordance with request of Board he had sent a letter (copy enclosed) to the Provincial Secretary on the subject.

After discussion it was decided to inform the Provincial Secretary that the Board approved of the Estimates submitted by Dr. Gilchrist, and, in addition, to emphasize the need for the provision of at least £300 for the collection of Statistics.

A suggestion of Mr. Daneel for provision for the importation of Cod, plaice was negatived owing to Dr. Gilchrist being of opinion that it was undesirable at present on account of the expensive process of acclimatizing the fish.

Detachable motors.

Dr. Gilchrist suggested provision for the purchase of detachable motors to be supplied to fishermen. These were obtainable at from £30-36 and need not entail reconstruction of boats.

Mr. Aling mentioned that Sir David Graaff would be prepared to advance money for purchasing motors provided adequate securety was forthcoming.

Messrs. Daneel & Irvin did not consider motors mentioned suitable for Cape fishing boats.

Mr. Irvin was prepared to lend a motor in his possession for experimental purposes.

Ultimately Mr. Irvin moved that the Irish and Scottish Fisheries Boards be asked to give details of grants given by them to fishermen for the purchase of (1) motors for boats and (2) motor boats, arrangements in regard to securety, working of the scheme, and any other methods adopted by them for the improvement of the fishing industry.

III Trout fishing : Mr. Gladstone-Hawke's letter re.

Letter to be sent to Provincial Secretary for his information.

IV Fishing Officer's report on Inspection of Eastern Province Fishing Stations.

Decided to return report to Provincial Secretary with the following remarks :-

(a) Port St. Johns : Oyster Licences :

If the provisions of the "Oyster Fisheries Act, 1888" apply to Port St. Johns, vendors of oysters should be required to take out the prescribed licence.

(b) Nets used by trawlers at East London & Port Elizabeth.

That the Scottish and Irish Fisheries Boards be applied to for information as to the size of mesh of net used by trawlers.

(c) Railing of fish at Port Elizabeth.

That the Railway Administration be asked to afford the same facilities at Port Elizabeth as at Cape Town, where fish can be trucked up to within sufficient time to allow the truck to be attached to the train.

(d) Gericke Bay : licence fee for fishing site.

The Board considers the payment of an annual fee of 10/-

10/- to Government for a fishing site a distinct hardship, and would be glad if the local Magistrate could be asked to submit a full report on the matter.

V. Compilation of pamphlet containing fishery laws up to date.

Resolved that the Provincial Secretary be asked to arrange for this to be done on lines similar to the pamphlet issued in 1911.

Vl Marine Biological Report, No. 1.

The Secretary was requested to apply to the Provincial Secretary for twelve copies of the above.

Vll Balance of 6/7 on hand in connection with advances made to the Board for administrative purposes.

Resolved that the amount be forwarded to the Provincial Secretary.

J W Mannik
Secretary to Fishery A Board

Confirmed
J D F Gilchrist
Chairman
3rd April, 1914.

Copy.

St James,
5th December, 1913.

The Provincial Secretary.

The Fishery Board has considered the Estimates for the year 1914 in accordance with your request and recommend, as they have already done on a previous occasion, that the item "Investigations, Surveys" etc., be considerably increased. They have already pointed out that to carry on further work in this direction the hire of a steam trawler, purchase of suitable gear, and other items are requiaite and for these no adequate provision has yet been made. The Survey work carried out by the Cape Colony has been followed by a great development of new fishing grounds, one firm alone employing five steam trawlers (valued at about £6,000 each) which are engaged now in following up the work of the "Pieter Faure". The Fishery Board recommend strongly that the Survey be continued and feel confident that it will lead to further and important developments of the fishing industry.

It would have been preferable to purchase a special boat for such a purpose, but, as the initial cost would be heavy, they recommend in the meantime that the work be carried out on a smaller scale and for a limited period - say, three or four months in the year. For this purpose, it is estimated that a sum of £1500 or £2000 is required, that is, in addition to the £500 now on the Estimates which is required for such inshore investigations as are now being carried out in the neighbourhood of Table Bay and at the Marine Laboratory at St James.

(sd) J.D.F.Gilchrist.

(200)

Minutes of Meeting of Fishery Advisory Board held on Friday, the 3rd April, 1914.

Present: Dr Gilchrist, and Messrs Runciman, Searle, Irvin, and Aling.

1. Minutes of previous meeting were confirmed.

2. Death of Mr MacLean:
Dr Gilchrist moved that a ~~xxxx~~ letter of sympathy be sent to Mrs MacLean in connection with the regrettable death of her husband. He added that Mr MacLean had always taken a great interest in the fishery industry and that his valued experience had always been much appreciated. His loss is much felt and his place on the Board would be difficult to fill.
Mr Runciman seconded. Agreed to.

3. Whaling Regulations: draft regulations submitted by the Provincial Secretary.
After discussion, the following recommendations were agreed upon:-
I. Third clause:
Recommend deletion of "or" between "killing" and "capturing", and addition of "or landing" after "capturing".
XIV. This clause is not practicable in respect to ~~xxxxx~~ refraining from the "hunting, capturing, or destroying of gravid females".
XV. Information is desired as to what object this clause has in view.
XVI. In the majority of cases it would not be practicable to remove whales within 24 hours after landing on foreshore. Sometimes it might be necessary to cut up the whales.
XVII. Information is desired as to what is contemplated under the words "or Fishery reserved by the Union Government or by the Provincial Administration for any special purpose, or for the protection, control, or conservation on such.....Fishery".
XXII. Recommend insertion of word "species" after "size".
XXIV. There appears to be no reason for this clause, the meaning of which is not altogether understood.
The Secretary was further instructed to point out that no reference is made to floating stations, provision for which method of whaling should receive consideration in the proposed regulations.

4. Fishery Statistics.
It was decided to point out to the Provincial Secretary the need of the immediate appointment of Fishery Officers at the principal fishery stations of the Cape in order that the collection of statistics could be taken in hand at once.

5. Size limit for White Stumpnose, White Steenbras & Elft caught in Knysna Lagoon: draft regulations from Pro. Secretary.
The regulation, which proposed to make illegal the capture, sale, or exposing for sale of :-
(a) White Stumpnose: of a size less than 8 inches.
(b) White Steenbras: " " " " 12 inches.
(c) Elft: " " " " 12 inches.
the measurements in each case to be from snout to the fork of the tail, was approved subject to the substitution of the words "extreme end" for "fork", and to the application of the regulation to Knysna Lagoon alone.
With regard to the larger question of the general imposition of a size limit under which it shall not be lawful to catch certain kinds of fish, it was decided to recommend that the Fisheries Officer be instructed to institute enquiries into the whole matter and submit his report in due course.

J. W. Munnik,
Secretary to Fishery Advisory Board.

Approved.
Jas Gilchrist
Chairman.
26th June, 1914.

Minutes of Meeting of Fishery Advisory Board held on Friday, the 26th June, 1914.

Present: Dr Gilchrist, and Messrs Daneel and Cripps (Fishery Officer).

New Board Members (proposed):

Mr Daneel proposed Mr J.G.Reid, Cardigan Chambers, Church Square, vice Mr MacLean (deceased).

It was decided to leave the recommendation of a further member to the Board (vice Mr Bateman) in the hands of the Chairman.

(N.B. On the 8th July the appointment of the following gentlemen as members of the Board was recommended to the Provincial Secretary, viz:- Messrs J.G.Reid, and Gus Trollip).

Port St Johns: Oyster Licenses.

Communication from Provincial Secretary explaining why vendors of oysters at Port St Johns are not required to take out licenses.

Noted.

Annual Report for 1913.

After a few minor alterations the report was adopted.

J.W.Munnik,

Secretary.

approved
J.H. Gilchrist
Chairman
11/9/14

Minutes of Meeting Held on Wednesday, the 9th December, 1914.

Present: Dr Gilchrist, and Messrs. Daneel, Aling, J.G.Reid, and Cripps (Fishery Officer).

(1) Death of Mr Searle.

Dr Gilchrist moved that a letter of condolence in connection with the death of Mr Searle be sent to his family. Although not often present at the Board's meetings Mr Searle had rendered great service to the fishing industry. He was the first one to make a success of trawling. His loss would be much felt.

Agreed to.

(2) Appointment of Messrs J.G. and A.H. Reid as Members of Board.

Dr Gilchrist announced the appointment of Messrs J.G.Reid and A.H.Reid as members of the Board. He extended a hearty welcome to Mr J.G.Reid, who was present. Mr A.H.Reid was unfortunately absent in Natal.

(3) Printing of Annual Report.

Dr Gilchrist read an intimation from the Provincial Secretary that owing to urgent need for effecting economies printing of Departmental Annual Reports were suspended.

(4) Suspension of Close Season for Oysters, Mossel Bay.

Dr Gilchrist emphasized that uncontrolled fishing lead to depletion of beds. He referred to several places where oysters [redacted] were once obtainable. The present close season (1st November to end of February) was fixed by Proclamation 482 of 1897, but its suitability was not known. He considered that the suspension of the present close season would facilitate investigations into the spawning habits of oysters. He therefore moved, and Mr Aling seconded, that the present close season be suspended till the end of February.

Mr Reid felt diffident to oppose but arguing from rigid enforcement of close season in England and America, he did not think it desirable to make any alteration without strong justification.

Mr Cripps, who desired his objection to be noted, strongly opposed any suspension. He did not think that the present International situation was affecting the oyster fishermen in any way. The majority of oyster gatherers were in the employ of one man who might perhaps benefit. Oysters now found, especially in the Riversdale District, are exceedingly small so much so that large numbers gathered were barely of regulation size. On his last visit to Bredasdorp the fishermen had pointed out places where oysters were once abundant but could not now be obtained.

It

The motion was agreed to. It was also agreed to recommend that immediate steps be taken to thoroughly investigate the spawning habits of oysters.

(5) Crawfish: extension of open season.

After discussing extension of open season for crawfish from

(a) Duiker Point to Cape Columbine from 16th to 31st October, 1914;

(b) Columbine Point to Orange River from 16th to 30th November, 1914

Mr Daneel moved that a communication be addressed to the Provincial Secretary expressing regret that in view of the importance of the matter and the detailed evidence on which the close seasons for crawfish were based, the Board was not consulted before the alterations in the present close seasons were arrived at.

Agreed to.

(6) Statistics re Crawfish.

It was decided to urge the Provincial Secretary to make immediate arrangements for securing from all canning companies from the commencement of next year quarterly returns of crawfish caught each day, the returns to embody the following particulars:-

(a) Date of capture.
(b) Total number of crawfish.
(c) Estimated percentage of females.
(d) Weather conditions.
(e) General remarks as to condition, etc.

J. W. Munnik,

Secretary to Fishery Advisory Bd.

Confirmed.

J. J. Gilchrist

Chairman,

17-2-1915.

Minutes of Meeting held on Wednesday, the 17th February, 1915.

Present: Dr Gilchrist, and Messrs Irvin, Aling, J.G. and A.H. Reid, and Cripps (F.O).

(1) Minutes of previous meeting were confirmed.

(2) Mr A.H.Reid: Dr Gilchrist welcomed Mr A. H. Reid, who made his first appearance as a member of the Board.

(3) Letters from Provincial Secretary in regard to:-

(a) Crawfish Canning Factories, dealing with
(1) Collection of statistics.
(2) Inspection of factories and their products.
(3) Inspection of products for export.

In regard to (1) it was understood from the Fishery Officer that statistics will soon be forthcoming.

In regard to (2) and (3) Mr Irvin moved and Mr A. H. Reid seconded, that consideration thereof be postponed until information available as to what is done in other countries in these matters, and that the Provincial Secretary be asked to make the necessary enquiries.
Agreed to.

(b) Fishery Statistics: supply of records of fish taken by trawlers, etc.

After discussion, Mr A. H. Reid moved, and Mr Irvin seconded, that it be pointed out to the Provincial Secretary that reliable statistics cannot be obtained without expenditure, and that it is essential that money should be allocated for this purpose. The Cape Fishing Industry is of far greater value than that of Natal yet the latter Province has been able to collect the statistics it requires. That it be also pointed out that owners of trawlers are quite agreeable to render returns but that such returns would be misleading without returns from the line fishermen.
Agreed to.

(4) Letter from Worcester Angling Society re eradication of big trout and witte-vis in Hex River owing to destruction by them of young fish.

It was decided to forward letter to the Provincial Secretary for the necessary action.

J. W. Munnik,

Secretary to Fishery Advisory Board.

Confirmed.

Chairman. 8/2/16

Minutes of Meeting held on 9th April, 1915.

Present: Dr Gilchrist, and Messrs Daneel, Irvin, J.G.Reid, A.H.Reid, and Aling.

(1) Zwartkops River Netting.

The Provincial Secretary submitted petitions from the following:-

Loton Tipper and 39 others, Port Elizabeth.
Loton Tipper and 10 others, Amsterdam Hoek, Zwartkops.
M.M.Steytler, Port Elizabeth.
Zwartkops Valley Land Company, Port Elizabeth.
J.J.Vosloo, Klipfontein.
W. Armstrong, Port Elizabeth.
O. Allison, Zwartkops.
P.E, and Zwartkops Angling and Acclimatisation Soc.
Inhabitants of Redhouse (37).
Zwartkops (52).
Port Elizabeth (879).
Uitenhage 2 (99) and (329).
J. Donoghue and 4 others, Port Elizabeth, Zwartkops, and Korston.
Rev. Scheepers, and 3 others.
J. Morgan.
District Superintendent, S.A.P., Port Elizabeth.

Messrs Wynne, Reynolds and Brown attended the meeting and the first two elected to give evidenme.

Mr Wynne, M.P.C.

Neither angler nor netter. 3½ years ago attended meetings tobecome acquainted with subject.

Desirable to prohibit netting for following reasons:-

Netters, with few exceptions who cannot be specially legislated for, are undesirable class of people. Redhouse and Zwartkops people object to them. They are most interested and ahould be considered first. Some difference of opinion. Some from Uitenhage Workshopsin favour of netting but the majority against.

Regards Zwartkops as practically nursery of fish from Knysna to East London, and netting interferes therewith. Nets are placed across spruits at low water, men sleep for some hours, then draw nets in, catching numerous young fish.

Suggestion for certain size of mesh not workable; difficult to control; mesh would become filled with various kinds of debris and young fish would be caught.

Present controversy largely arisen through few men breaking law and being heavily fined; and also to Dr Gilchrist's visit to Port Elizabeth to enquire into close season for angling. Mr Dolly was invited and attended meeting. Erroneous idea however got abroad that Dr Gilchrist arrived at decision with regard to netting without consulting Uitenhage. Question of netting did come up at meeting in an indirect way and a resolution was passed to maintain the law as at present.

Mr Reynolds, M.P.C.

Ahreed with Mr Wynne. Attended meetings of both sides and knowing people personally he found them practically in favour of prohibition. Certain moral effects have to be considered at Redhouse and Zwartkops. Fishing for market purposes need not be considered. Does not remember fish from Zwartkopsplaced on Port

Elizabeth

Elizabeth. Looked on river fishing as a sport. Public meeting at Port Elizabeth largely attended. Uitenhage case received no support, the majority being against netting.

Dr Gilchrist.

Pointed out that the merits of the case should be considered om:-

(1) Result of three years' prohibition.
(2) Destruction of Spawn.
(3) Spawning of fish.
(4) Destruction by netting.
(5) Whether netting increased number of fish in river,

It was on these points that evidence was required.

Mr Reynolds.

Meetings at Port Elizabeth with one exception all agreed that fish increased in river during suspension period. Mr Wynne concurred and read evidence given at meeting to that effect

Mr Brown, M.L.A.

Stated that Sir Edgar Walton regretted that he could not be present and added that Sir Edgar was opposed to netting.

He also presented a letter from Mr L. Tipper in favour of netting but stated that he personally had no knowledge of the subject one way or the other.

Mr Wynne.

Remarked that as the river was the nursery of fish, to destroy fish therein was to destroy the food supply.

He understood that if set nets allowed netters prepared to have a larger mesh.

He has been present at the pulling in of nets and found any amount of young fish smothered. Great bulk of fish caught came from the sea. Prior to prohibition fish caught was sold but understood netters were prepared to guarantee that this would not be done in future.

In reply to Mr Reid, he stated that Mr Tipper sold fish caught. He had buildings on bank of river so could secure entry to river for those who might wish to net.

Partial netting was undesirable because uncontrollable and would require larger police forde, entailing extra expenditure.

A letter from Mr Garcia was read expressing regret at being unable to attend and hoping that he would be given an opportunity of placing his views before the Board.

It was accordingly decided to adjourn the discussion to the 16th ~~mmat~~ April.

(2) a. Time of departure of boats from Cape Town Docks fmor fishing purposes, and
b. Obtaining bait in Docks area.

Mr Daneel pointed out that boats are not allowed to go fishing before 6.30 a.m. This restriction was not felt much

last

last year as fishing was practically over by August, but in present season fishermen have already been seriously inconvenienced, especially when the fish were far out.

He also stated that the Docks is the only available place for procuring bait. Permission has been granted to the crew of a particular boat - and to them only - to obtain bait required for the fishing boats, and the supply thus procured has been found inadequate for all requirements.

He therefore moved, and Mr Irvin seconded, that the Provincial Secretary be asked to approach the Military authorities to secure such relaxation of the regulations as would afford local fishermen greater facilities for catching fish and obtaining bait.

Agreed to.

(3) Killing of trout (big) and witte-vis in the Hex River.

Mr Aling moved that the Board approve of the granting of a special permit to Mr A. H. Reid for catching big trout and indigenous fish in rivers within the Division of Worcester and adjacent areas, for a period of three months from date of issue of permit.

Agreed to.

J. W. Munnik,

Secretary to Fishery Advisory Board

Confirmed.

Chairman. 8/2/16

Minutes of Meeting held on the 16th April, 1915.

Present: Dr Gilchrist, and Messrs Runciman, Daneel, Irvin, A.H. and J. G. Reid, Aling, and Cripps (F.C.).

(1) Killing of big trout and witte-vis in Hex River.

Papers in connection with above returned by Provincial Secretary with request that they be laid before Board as it was understood that decision at previous meeting was arrived at without reference to correspondence.

It was decided to advise the Provincial Secretary that the Board was still of opinion that there is no objection to the granting of the permit asked for, and to point out that the permit is required only for the present open season, i.e. up to the 31st May and for the purpose of dragging the pools by net before the rivers become full.

(2) Zwartkops River Netting.

In his evidence before the Board Mr Garcia, M.P.C., pointed out that prawn is the natural food of river fish and that their number has been greatly reduced owing to their nets use being abused. At the meeting at Port Elizabeth held by Dr Gilchrist to meet anglers, record of fish caught by anglers was asked for but not produced. It was the only statistical record available as to whether fish had increased. He attended this meeting but found it distinctly hostile to netters. If fish had increased people would have been attracted to Zwartkops but such is not the case. Dr Gilchrist attended meeting netting and only found sharks and fish up to 40 lb. which do not take hook. If necessary to prohibit netting, present time unsuitable owing to prevailing economic conditions. Poor people not allowed to catch fish for sale. Would be prepared to accept conditions enforcing mesh of a certain size, fish less than 9 inches to be returned to the waters, and Magistrate to determine whether netting should be allowed. The assertion that netters destroy fry and spawn was in conflict with opinion expressed by Dr Gilchrist in a recent publication that the principal fish do not spawn in the rivers but in the sea. The fry of soles are caught by sharks. When the mud banks become dry enormous numbers of fish are caught by sea birds. Quite prepared to compromise. No set nets to be used in spruits or creeks which run dry at any time. Netters should be allowed to fish on Public Holidays, and two days in each month during spring tides. Nets may contain seaweed, etc., but fish go over the net. Has no objection to set nets being abolished. At Tipper's place, where there is no mud bank, saw no objection to use of set net. Replace by drag or seine nets. Seine nets with bag in centre should not be allowed to lie in river but should be taken into river and drawn to the bank.

Mr Runciman: If restrictions are withdrawn, anyone can fish.

Mr Garcia: Magistrate should be empowered to grant permits for each occasion to man in charge of party if satisfied that conditions will be carried out. If conditions violated, no further permits to be granted. Netting used by a large number of workmen at Uitenhage. Netting does not interfere with angling: it improves fishing by killing vermin, etc.

Netting

Netting had been allowed for the best part of a century and was then suddenly stopped. At the time he advised people to wait and see the result of the three years' prohibition; then, if their contention be correct that fishing was not affected, to make strong representations to Government.

In conclusion, Mr Garcia read a note to the following effect and handed it to the Chairman for record:-

"In the absence of statistical evidence that fishing in the Zwartkops River had improved since the prohibition of netting, and in view of the conflicting evidence, I think a suitable compromise would be to allow netting in the Zwartkopson Public Holidays and on one day during each spring tide, under the restrictions suggested by the netters. The mesh of net to be increased from 1½ to 1¾ inches if Dr Gilchrist considers 1½ inches too small. This arrangement to be fixed by Proclamation for a period of three years during which time careful observations might be made".

After discussion by Board, Mr J. G. Reid moved, and Mr Irvin seconded:-

"That the provisions of the existing regulations be extended for a further period of twelve months and that, in the interval, scientific investigations be conducted under the direction of Dr Gilchrist and experimental nettings be carried out under adequate supervision arranged by the Department".

Agreed to.

J. W. Munnik,

Secretary to Fishery Advisory Bd.

Confirmed.

Chairman. 8/2/16

Minutes of Meeting held on Monday, the 11th October, 1915.

Present: Dr.Gilchrist, and Messrs. J.G.Reid, Irving, Daneel and Cripps (Fishery Officer) (Letter of apology from Mr.Arthur Reid for non attendance read)

(1) Extension of Crawfish Fishing Season.

Letter from Messrs.Hickson & Sons, Woodstock, submitted by the Provincial Secretary, read by the Chairman Mr.Daneel expressed the opinion that the seasons should not be altered.

Mr.Reid pointed out that by proclaiming four areas instead of three the fish would receive the same protection as at present.

Moved by Mr.Daneel and seconded by Mr.Irving:- that instead of three areas there be [redacted] four, as follows:-

(1) From Cape Point following the coast line in a Northerly direction to Duiker Point, from the 15th September in one year, to the 15th January in the following year.

(2) From Duiker Point following the coast Northwards to Matrees Point situated on the Malmesbury Coast South of Bokke Bay, from the 15th October in the one year to 15th February in the following year.

(3) From Matrees Point following the Coast line Northwards to Cape Columbine, from the 15th November, in one year to the 15th March in the year following.

(4) From Cape Columbine following the coast line Northwards to the Orange River, from the 15th December, in one year, to the 15th April in the following year.

The Secretary was in structed to intimate that apart from this recommendation, the Board did not feel disposed to recommend an extension of the fishing season for the area embracing the fishing grounds at Oude Kraal and Robben Island, as there was evidence to show that fish on these grounds are soft and in an unfit state for commercial purposes.

Confirmed.

Chairman. 8/2/16

A. C. Cripps.

Acting Secretary.

Minutes of Meeting held on Tuesday, 26th October, 1915.

Present: Dr. Gilchrist, and Messrs. A.L.Reid, J.G.Reid, Arling, and Cripps (Fishery Officer.)
A letter was read from Mr. Runciman expressing his regret at not being able to be present but adding that he was strongly opposed to any relaxation of the Oyster Regulation - rather they should be stiffened up.

(1) Proposed Suspension of Oyster Close Season: Letter from Provincial Secretary.

Moved by Mr. A.H.Reid and seconded by Mr. J.G.Reid: That in view of Dr. Gilchrist's investigation having proved that oysters are in spawning throughout the close season, the Board unanimously recommends that the application be not acceded to but that further investigation be made, as to whether the shifting of the season from an earlier to a later date is necessary or advisable as it may be found that spawning season may commence or end some time before of after the present period of close season.

(2) Mr. A.H.Reid submitted for view of members of the Board the contents of the stomach of a Rainbow trout under 1 lb. in weight, killed in the Nerste River on 21/10/15. (Contents of stomach 8 small trout of from 2 to ¾ inches in length.)
A record of Mr. Reid's various observations taken of the different trout captured on the several rivers of the Western Province, was also submitted for view of the members. Much salient information regarding the barometrical variations, conditions of fish, etc. was obtained from this valuable document.

Confirmed.
Chairman 8/2/16

A. C. Cripps.
Acting Secretary.

Minutes of Meeting of Fishery Advisory Board
held on Friday, 7th January, 1916.

Present:
Messrs Irvin, J.G.Reid, Aling, and Cripps (Fishery Officer).

(1) Alteration in Trout Open Season (Western Area).

Mr Irvin moved, and Mr Reid seconded:-

"That ffom the information available, the Board is of opinion that the application for the alteration of the present trout open season, so as to extend it to the 30th April, should be acceded to as an experiment for the current year; and that the Angling Associations should be asked to make observations during the period in question, and furnish the Provincial Secretary with the results at the close of the season".

Agreed to.

(2) Estimates for 1916-17, etc.

Mr Reid moved, and Mr Irvin seconded;-

"That the Provoncial Secretary be asked for a statement of the provision made on the Fisheries Vote for the current financial year, and of the amounts expended under each of the sub-votes; and also for particulars of the amounts proposed to be placed on the Estimates for the year 1916-17".

Agreed to.

(3) Fishery Officer: duties of.

A discussion took place on the contravention of the Fishery Regulations, when the following were emphasized:-

(a) Capture of female Crayfish in berry in Table Bay waters, and also along Malmesbury Coast.
(b) Capture of undersized crawfish.
(c) Capture of undersized snoek at Lambert's Bay.
(d) Netting within prohibited area in Table Bay.
(e) Boats bearing no registration number fishing for profit.
(f) Inspection of fishing stations along the Coast.

Mr Irvin moved, and Mr Reid seconded:-

"That the Board is strongly of opinion that the services of the Fishery Officer should be exclusively devoted to the duties pertaining to his office, and would urge that immediate effect be given to its representation owing to continuous contraventions of existing regulations".

Agreed to.

Confirmed.

Chairman. 8/2/16

J. W. Munnik,

Secretary.

Minutes of Meeting of Fishery Advisory Board held on Tuesday, the 8th February, 1916.

Present: Messrs Runciman (in the Chair), Irvin, Daneel, Aling, J. G. and A. H. Reid, and Cripps (Fishery Officer).

I. Minutes of the previous six meetings were confirmed.

II. Dr Gilchrist's absence:

Letter from Dr Gilchrist was read stating that he would be in town about the middle of the month, and adding that the re-constitution of the Board would probably be welcomed by members as bringing the Board into more direct contact with the Department.

III. Crawfish Season:

(1) Application from Magistrate, Hopefield, for termination of crawfish close season in area Matroos Point to Cape Columbine on the 15th February, instead of 15th March, 1916, in view of probable distress among fisherfolk.

(2) Application from Stephan Bros. for permission to make experimental hauls of crawfish at Jacobs Bay and North West Bay to test whether fish in condition or not.

Mr Runciman moved, and Mr Daneel seconded;- "That owing to the want of data the Board is not prepared to recommend the application for favourable consideration unless an immediate investigation be made by the Fishery Officer, and he is satisfied that crawfish can be caught without detriment to the industry, in which event the Fishery Officer should also make experimental hauls during the relaxed period and submit a report on the results".

Agreed to.

IV. Fishery Officer: disposal of services of:

Letter from Provincial Secretary relative to Mr Cripps' temporary partial withdrawal from outside duties.

Mr Runciman moved, and Mr Irvin seconded:- "That the Board still regrets that Mr Cripps' services are utilized for purposes at variance with the object of his original appointment. It desires to animadvert on the numerous communications submitted from time to time as to the need of proper and adequate supervision, the observance of regulations, the submission of statistics, the inspection of stations, and the furnishing of reports on matters pertaining to the fishing industry; and considers that the Fishery Officer should be occupied exclusively with the duties relating to his office. Recent complaints in regard to the Crawfish Industry accentuates the need of proper supervision".

Agreed to.

V. Annual Report of Board for 1913:

Mr A. H. Reid moved, and Mr Irvin seconded;- "That the Board extremely regrets that its Report for the year 1913 has not been published, and would urge that this be done immediately and copies circulated among the Executive Committee and Members of the Provincial Council".

Agreed to.

VI.

VI. Trout, extension of season to April.

Mr A. H. Reid expressed regret that this had been done in regard to the Berste and Louwrens Rivers. During January and February these rivers do not run, and the trout are driven into pools where, besides being at the mercy of ~~the witvisch~~, otters, duikers, and cormorants, they are scooped out by people who have no licence to fish. The idea of getting special ~~xxxxxxxx~~ permits ~~to fish~~ was to drag the pools for witvisch and large cannibal trout and thus preserve the trout. Certain licence holders should be made special constables to see that the regulations are observed.

It was decided that the matter be left over for consideration by the re-constituted Board.

VII. Re-constitution of Fishery Board:

Letter from Provincial Secretary announcing re-constitution of the Board as follows:-

The Board to consist of nine members, including two members of the Provincial Council as representative of the fishing interests in and about Cape Town and in the Eastern area of the Province, and the Provincial Secretary, who is to be Chairman.

The present members, except Mr Aling on account of departmental reasons, to be eligible for re-election and the period of office to be for one year, commencing the 1st March, 1916.

It was decided to advise the Administrator as follows:-

"That the present members are prepared to accept re-nomination provided greater consideration can be given to the recommendations of the Bo-ard, and that financial facilities are provided for the improvement and development of the fishing industry".

Agreed to.

The Board further would esteem it a favour if the Hon. the Administrator would be so good as to accord the members an interview for the purpose of discussing questions relating to the fishing industry.

It was also decided to ask for an early reply to the Board's request for particulars, inter alia, of the amounts proposed to be placed on the Estimates in regard to Fisheries for the financial year 1916-1917; as well as particulars of expenditure incurred by Natal on its Fisheries, the number of officers employed, and the nature of, and the amount derived from, direct taxation of the fishing industry.

It was decided to hold a further meeting of the Board before the suggested meeting with Sir Frederick, when it is hoped that the information above asked for will be available for consideration.

VIII.

VIII. Crawfish Industry:

Letter from the Secretary, Cape Town Chamber of Commerce, asking for permission for a deputation of the Management Committee of the Chamber to wait upon the Fishery Board to discuss the question of the protection and development of the Crawfish Industry.

It was decided to refer the matter to the Provincial Secretary.

IX. Trawling for Crawfish:

The Fishery Officer stated that the Provincial Secretary had desired him to inform the Board that information had reached him that the North Bay Canning Co, and Messrs Irvin and Johnston, Ltd., intend to commence trawling for crawfish.

Mr Irvin, on behalf of the Companies, stated that the matter was not yet definitely settled. The first step would be to conduct a series of experimental hauls with an otter trawl to ascertain the effects of catching crawfish in this way. It is not contemplated trawling within the three mile area, and the Companies would be glad if the Fishery Officer could form one of the party when the experimental hauls are to be made. The firms concerned have been forced to a consideration of the adoption of this method of catching crawfish owing to an attempt on the part of the Italian fishermen to create a 'ring' with the object of demanding 6/- per 100 crawfish. Fishermen are being asked to contract to sell crawfish at the rate of 5/- per 100, instead of 3/6dd as heretofore; and, though they acknowledge that the offer is very good, they state that they are unable to enter into contracts owing to intimidation by the Italians, and because they fear damage to their boats and possibly personal injury. The Companies concerned have a large amount of money invested in the crawfish industry and will do nothing contrary to the best interests of the business.

The following resolution was passed by the Board on the subject:-

"That trawling for crawfish is a dangerous innovation and should not be allowed until the matter has been investigated, and reported upon, by Dr Gilchrist, and the Fishery Officer".

At the conclusion of the meeting, Mr Runciman thanked the members for their presence and trusted that the reconstructed Board would be a live body. He much regretted that so little improvement in the Fishing Industry had been made but this was due to advantage not having been taken to give effect to the Board's recommendations.

He wished also to express the Board's appreciation of the services rendered from time to time by Mr Aling who, for departmental reasons, will no longer be a member.

J. W. Munnik,

Secretary.

Confirmed.

J D F Gilchrist

Chairman.

16/2/16

Minutes of Meeting of Fishery Advisory Board held on Wednesday, the 16th February, 1916.

Present: Mr Gilchrist (Chairman), and Messrs Irvin, Runciman, and A.H. and J.G.Reid.

Fishing Industry: development of, and Estimates in regard to.

Mr Mansergh, Provincial Secretary, attended the meeting, and a long discussion ensued in regard to the Fishing Industry and the taking of effective steps for its progress and development.

An extended report of the proceedings was taken by a Reporter who specially attended the meeting at the request of Mr Mansergh. A copy of the report has been promised the Board, and this will form an annexure to these Minutes when received.

As a result of the discussion, Mr Runciman moved:-

"That in the opinion of the Board it is essential for the development of the Industry that at least £5,000 should be provided on the Estimates for 1916-17 for preliminary action in connection therewith".

Ultimately, it was decided to postpone consideration of the motion until the next meeting of the Board on the 23rd February, 1916, when it is hoped, in accordance with Mr Mansergh's request, to prepare a detailed report of essential matters together with the estimated expenditure for the year in regard to each item.

Resignation of Mr Daneel:

The Secretary was instructed to intimate to Mr Daneel the Board's deep regret at his resignation and, while expressing its appreciation of the services rendered by him during his membership, to hope that Mr Daneel will see his way clear to reconsider his decision.

J. W. Munnik,

Secretary.

CONFIRMED.

J G Gilchrist

Chairman.
23/2/1916.

Minutes of Meeting of Fishery Advisory Board held Wednesday, the 23rd February, 1916.

Present: Dr Gilchrist, and Messrs Runciman, Irvin, J.G. and A. H. Reid, and Cripps (Fishery Officer).

I. Crawfish; inspection of canning companies and their products for export.

Mr J.G.Reid stated that the Canning Companies would welcome inspection in regard to condition, size, and quality of fish canned. Government grading of exported article would be a great help but he questioned whether Government would be prepared to do it as it meant the engagement of a practical and experienced man.

Mr Irvin moved, and Mr J. G. Redd seconded:-

"That the Fishery Officer and his Assistants should systematically inspect the Canning Factories and their working, and that, for this purpose, steps should be taken to get the consent of the Canning Companies to allow access to the Fsctories".

Agreed to.

Mr Runciman moved, and Mr A. H. Reid seconded:-

"That the Provincial Secretary be asked to communicate with Dr Mitchell, Assistant Medical Officer for the Union, with a view to suggesting that in the event of any amendment being made to the Food and Drugs Act of 1890, attention should be paid to the wholesome condition of fish canned in South Africa for sale locally and for exportation".

Agreed to.

II. Estimates for 1916-1917.

Mr Runciman explained that his Estimate of £5,000, which appears on the minutes of the last meeting, was based on the assumption that such sum would be in addition to the amount (£2,284) provided in the current financial year's Estimates.

The framing of the Estimates was then proceeded with and resulted as follows:-

Inspection of Fisheries (including salaries of Fishery Officer at £350, a Fishery Officer for the Eastern Province at £200, travelling expenses, and hiring of launch.....£1,000

Statistics..... 500

Fishery Investigations..... 500

Marine

Marine Biological Survey.....£2,500

Crawfish Investigations, and Hatching of Crawfish, including for the latter purpose salary of Expert Officer at £300 p.a..... 1,000

Total £5,500

From this amount must be deducted £225 (Salary of Fishery Officer) and £700 (Investigations, Surveys, etc), which already appear on the current financial year's Estimates, so that the recommendations of the Board shew an actual increase of £4,575.

Recommendations in regard to Trout and other fresh-water fishes were deferred pending the receipt of information promised by the Provincial Secretary in regard to the revenue derived from the issue of licenses and the sale of ~~permits~~ trout, etc., during the year 1915. Information in regard to these points were desired not only in regard to Jonker's Hoek Trout Hatchery but also in regard to the one at Pirie.

The Secretary was instructed to obtain, at the same time, particulars of accruals to Revenue from Marine Fisheries in the way of licenses, fines, e5c., during 1915, so that the same could be circularised among the members of the Board.

In drawing attention to the salary of the Fishery Officer, Mr J. G. Reid stated that he had been specially instructed by the Canning Companies, who had volunteered to subscribe £1,000 towards the develolment of the Crawfish Industry, to inform the Board that, if the duties of the Fishery Officer are to be properly and conscientiously carried out, the salary of the present Officer is entirely inadequate; and that the Canning Companies

are

are strongly of opinion that Mr Cripps should receive at the very least ~~£300~~ £350 per annum.

This view met with the unanimous support of the Members of the Board, and it was therefore decided to submit a strong recommendation that Mr Cripps' salary should be increased to £350 per annum.

The Secretary was instructed to point out that in connection with the proposed hatching of crawfish, it will be necessary to appoint an Expert to take charge of the work, and that for this position a salary of at least £300 per annum should be offered. The need of proper control over the Fisheries of the Eastern Province also engaged attention, with the result that it was decided to advise the Provincial Secretary that the work could be only effectively carried out by the appointment of a Fishery Officer at a salary of £200 per annum.

Mr Runciman intimated that firms like Messrs Irvin and Johnston were prempared to place facilities at the disposal of the Government so that marine investigational work could be carried out on their boats free of charge, provided that the work of the boats is not interfered with. Such help could be regarded as a contribution towards the development of the Fishing Industry. Mr Irvin concurred, and stated that his firm would be only too willing to help in the direction indicated. Dr Gilchrist doubted whether, from a practical point of view, it would be possible to take advantage of the offer in any thorough investigation, but it was decided to acquaint the Provincial Secretary with the willing co-operative spirit of the Fishing Companies, who are anxious in every possible way to advance the interests of the industry.

The Estimates proposed for the year 1916-1917 would therefore, subject to the reservation in regard to trout and other fresh-water fishes, be as follows:-

	Provision already existing (1915-1916 Estimates).	Board's recommendations.	Total
Marine Biologist & Fisheries Adviser	£250	-	250
Curator, Jonker's Hoek Trout Hatchery	450	-	450
Labourer, " " "	48	-	48
Secretary, Fishery Board.....	36	-	36
Inspection of Fisheries:			
Fishery Officer.....	225	125 (increase)	
Fishery Officer (Eastern Province).	-	200	1,000
~~Maintenance~~ Travelling expenses & hire of launch	-	450	
Statistics.....)	500)		
Fishery Investigations.....) 700	500)	2,800	3,500
Marine Biological Survey.....)	2,500)		
Crawfish Investigations and Hatching of Crawfish (including salary of Expert Officer).....	-	1,000	1,000
Grant to Eastern Province Acclimatisation Society.....	350	-	350
Working expenses, Jonker's Hoek Trout Hatchery.....	225	-	225
	£2,284	£4,575	£6,859

The

These Estimates do not, of course, include Establishment Charges for which, it was understood, special provision would be made.

III. Proposed suspension of Crawfish Close Season, No. 3 Area, Matroos Point to Cape Columbine.

Mr J. G. Reid drew attention to the recommendation of the Board at its last meeting on this subject, and enquired whether the Fishery Officer could acquaint the Board with the result of inspection.

Mr Cripps stated that he had found the crawfish up to Columbine Point, in No 3 Area, in excellent condition, but immediately beyond he had found females in berry and ~~undersized~~ small females.

Mr Runciman moved, and Mr J.G.Reid seconded:-

"That the Provincial Secretary be asked whether effect had been given to the report of the Fishery Officer in terms of the Board's recommendation".

Agreed to.

The Secretary was at the same time asked to ~~point out~~ emphasize the need of the Fishery Officer continuing, if the close season be suspended, making experimental hauls of crawfish and submitting reports on the results.

J. W. Munnik,

Secretary.

Confirmed.

Chairman. 10/3/16

Minutes of Meeting of Fishery Advisory Board, held at Huguenot Buildings, Victoria Street, on Friday, the 10th March, 1916.

(First Meeting of Board as Re-constituted)

Present: Mr Mansergh (Chairman), Dr Gilchrist, and Messrs Runciman, J.G.Reid, A.H.Reid, Stephan, Van Zyl, and Irvin. Mr Cripps (Fishery Officer).

In opening the proceedings Mr Mansergh, on behalf of the Administrator, welcomed the Members. He expressed the hope that certain notes* he had caused to be circulated would be of service. These notes were intended to obviate a few remarks which he had contemplated. He therefore presumed that the Agenda should be at once proceeded with.

Mr van Zyl mentioned that the copies of certain papers received by him were illegible, and Mr Runciman asked whether more spacing could be allowed when typing reports, etc. The Chairman undertook to arrange that these difficulties should be obviated.

MAP OF COAST.

Mr Mansergh promised to cause each Member to be supplied with a copy of a map of the Coast of the Cape Provinces, shewing Fishing Stations, etc.

STATISTICAL STATEMENTS.

Mr Mansergh stated that when statictical statements or other documents of interest in connection with the Fishing Industry are received by the Provincial Administration, they would be circulated direct to Members of the Board without waiting for submission at a formal meeting.

ESTIMATES FOR 1916 - 1917.

In dealing with this matter in order to introduce definite discussion upon a subject of special importance and of interest to the Board, Mr Mansergh pointed out that, in connection with Fishery Investigations, Surveys, Cost of obtaining Statistics, etc., the sum of £2,300 X was available, and that it was left to the Board to suggest

X (including £1000 contributed by the Canning Companies) the

* See annexure

the allocation of this amount.

Mr A. H. Reid raised the question of the £4,575 discussed by the Board at its last meeting. It was pointed out that the full amount available was only £2,300 (£1,000 subscribed by the Canners, and £1,300 by the Provincial Administration, the latter being an advance of some £600 on the amount which was voted for the current year, but of which little had been spent.

Mr J. G. Reid said that he had understood from the Administrator that the Provincial Administration would contribute on the £ for £ principle in connection with the development of the Crawfish Industry. Mr Mansergh felt that the position had not been properly understood as, though the Administrator was most sympathetic, he had not, as previously explained, bound himself to a particular sum. Unfortunately £1,300 was as much as could now be spared. In reply to an enquiry whether the £1,000 subscribed by the Canners should be devoted exclusively to the Crawfish Industry, Mr J. G. Reid said that he was not quite prepared to say so as there was a larger view to bear in mind- the good of the Fishing Industry generally.

Mr Runciman stated that he was greatly disappointed at the tone of Mr Mansergh's memorandum, and this was increased by the admission that the Provincial Administration was utterly unable to help the Fishing Industry as it deserved to be. Statistics proved the potentialities of the industry , which were known only to a few. The Board had now sat for a number of years, and had made recommendations from time to time of great value: as an Advisory body it was useless sitting if the advice tendered could not be accepted. The

Board

Board had been re-constituted, and he had hoped for better times and that something would be done. Agriculture received help in every way but little help could be extended to an industry, the value of which was practically unknown. He welcomed the advent of Mr van Zyl on the Board, and hoped he would make his voice heard in the Provincial Council on behalf of the industry. The Reports of the Board should be published so that the Public could see how impotent the Provincial Administration was in the matter.

Mr Stephan stated that when he addressed his letter to the press he had no idea that the points contained therein had already received the consideration of the Board. The Public ought to be made acquainted with the Reports of the Board.

Mr Mansergh pointed out the peculiar functions of the Board which are advisory only. Although the Executive and Provincial Administration are thoroughly in sympathy with Mr Runciman's views, the question of finance was the great obstacle to liberal provision of funds for the purposes recommended by the Board. The daily needs of the industry, in the way of regulations, inspections, etc., had been attended to. This he mentioned in view of a feeling that nothing had been done for the benefit of the industry. The State could only be the pioneer, and after that development must come from the activities of the commercial man. As the Board would now see, in a time of real financial stress an amount, small though it might be, has been provided; and he would suggest that the Board drew up a programme as to the manner in which this £2,300 should be spent.

Mr Runciman insisted that publicity would educate the people as to the value of the industry. People think that the Board is asleep. He instanced the great difficulties experienced in getting the Kalk Bay Harbour constructed.

Mr Mansergh considered that it would be a mistake on the part of the Board to attempt to raise public opinion and

thus

thus perhaps hamper the Administration. It would also be somewhat foreign to the functions of an Advisory Board to do so.

Mr Runciman pointed out that in Scotland the industry was built up by the means of Advisory Board. He also instanced what Germany and Natal had done in this direction.

Mr Mansergh looked upon the Board's recommendations of 1912 as an excellent conception of what could be done if funds were unlimited. With the money available, a commencement could however be made, and he hoped that next year a larger amount might be available.

Mr van Zyl suggested that a strong Committee be appointed to interview the Administrator so that the position could be placed before him.

Mr Irvin pointed out that the Board has already on several occasions interviewed the Administrator.

The suggestion was not pressed, and eventually the following allocations were agreed upon:-

STATISTICS:

£500 to be expended in procuring Fishery Statistics. The selection of Stations from which the Returns are to be obtained to be made by the Administration.

FISHERY INVESTIGATIONS:

£500 to be devoted to Fishery Investigations. Of this, the major portion to be spent on Crawfish Investigation.

Dr Gilchrist promised to draw up a scheme in connection with Crawfish Investigation and to submit this for the information of the Board.

POLICE SUPERVISION:

£400. Mr Mansergh promised to communicate with the Union Commissioner of Police to allow the Police to resume their old duty and thus secure stricter enforcement of the Fishery Regula-

tions

tions. An Honorarium of about £1 per month could be given, if necessary. About forty Stations would require to be dealt with.

ADDITIONAL INSPECTORS: £300. This amount was apportioned for Fishery Inspectors at a salary of about £150 each.

The nett result of the allocations agreed upon was as follows:-

Statistics	£500.
Fishery Investigations	£500.
Police Supervision	£400.
Additional Inspectors	£300.
	£1,700.

An amount of £600 (£2,300 less £1,700) is still open for allotment.

TABLE BAY HARBOUR: Mr Stephan drew attention to the proposed Table Bay Harbour for fishing boats. After discussion, Mr Mansergh promised to obtain information in regard to its safety, accessibility to Town and from the sea, and the probable difficulties in landing fish. Mr Stephan pointed out that the pier is 8 feet above the water.

If possible, the plans of the Harbour to be obtained for the information of the Board.

NETTING IN RIVERS: Mr Stephan drew attention to netting in rivers, which he considered very injurious to fish. He contended that the scarcity of geelbek was due to overnetting in rivers.

Mr Mansergh stated that the question of netting in the Berg River had been investigated by Dr Gilchrist, who, he believed, viewed the matter very seriously. He promised to arrange for the circulation of the reports on the Berg River Netting among the Members of the Board.

ADJOURNMENT:

ADJOURNMENT:

At this stage Mr van Zyl moved the adjournment of the Meeting.

It was decided to hold the next meeting on Friday, the 17th March, at 2.30 p.m.

J. W. Munnik,

Secretary.

CONFIRMED.

CHAIRMAN.

17th March, 1916.

M E M O R A N D U M.

On the occasion of the first Meeting of the Fisheries Advisory Board under recent re-arrangement of its Membership, the Administrator desires to welcome the Members of the Board and to express his gratification at the fact that the Provincial Administration will receive the benefit of their advice and assistance in matters connected with the advancement of the important fishing industry of this Province.

As now constituted the Board comprises amongst its Members, inter alia, representatives in the Provincial Council of constituencies which are specially interested in the industry, as well as Members directly connected with commercial undertakings founded upon the industry - a necessary element of scientific and expert knowledge being present in the person of Dr. Gilchrist, the Marine Biological Adviser to the Provincial Administration. The combination of these elements with the experience of the remaining Members of the Board in various directions in public life will, it is trusted, yield advantageous results.

The Fisheries Advisory Board of the Cape of Good Hope has now been in existence for a substantial period, having been created by the Government of the late Cape Colony at the time when definite action was first taken under Dr. Gilchrist's guidance for the development of the sea fisheries of the then Colony and for the propagation of trout in inland waters.

Both/

229

Both these matters have materially advanced since the period in question, but there remain a variety of questions of major importance to which the attention of the Board may with advantage be directed, and in respect to which their advice will be valued by the Provincial Administration.

The attached letter from the Board dated 27th March 1912 conveys a review of major matters which at that time the Board considered should be undertaken for the benefit of the Provincial Fishing Industry.

The programme then laid down has not up till now been found possible of realisation, owing to the financial conditions which have affected the undertakings of the Province, but some progress has been made and it is hoped that further advance will be possible despite the fact that financial conditions at the present time are by no means favourable to increased expenditure.

The creation of a Fisheries Department (which is one of the proposals contained in the letter referred to as an adjunct to the ordinary machinery of the Provincial Administration) is not contemplated. Under the constitutional machinery which now exists the functions of the Provincial Executive are sufficient for all administrative necessities in this direction and can be supplemented by scientific or professional and technical assistance as may from time to time be found necessary in respect to the remaining items mentioned in this letter.

As/

230

As in all matters of public administration the primary consideration is that of finance. This is a matter for adjustment and treatment between the Executive of the Province and the Provincial Council; but in the preparation of proposals for consideration by these Bodies the Administrator looks forward to receiving valuable assistance from the advice which Members of the Board from their general and special experience are in a position to afford upon what may be described as questions of general policy connected with the fishing industry. These questions lie apart from questions of Executive operations which are the constitutional function of the Provincial Executive acting under the law, and the sphere of the Advisory Board, therefore, lies in the direction of considering the wider aspects of the interests of the industry rather than in the treatment of local detail arising out of the circumstances of particular branches or phases thereof. In the treatment of those wider questions the resources of the Provincial Administration and of its advisers will be available for such enquiry and investigation as may be found necessary for facilitation of the labours of the Board.

Recently a reference occurred to the functions of the Board as approximating to those of a Board of Directors; but this comparison scarcely reflects the real position. The functions of direction and administration in the sense referred to are constitutionally the attributes of the Executive Committee of the Province and are not of delegation.

The functions of the Advisory Board,

therefore/

therefore, as the name implies, consultative and not executive. The line of demarcation will not be very sharply drawn in practical working, but it may be as well that the underlying principle should be made clear.

Subjects of the wider character above-mentioned in the nature of matters of policy are found referred to in the Board's letter of 1912 - previously mentioned - and these embrace items such as the continuance of the Fishery survey, inaugurated and partially completed under Dr. Gilchrist's direction.

Prosecution of scientific investigations in the life history and habits of fish of various species. To some extent work of this class has been prosecuted by Dr. Gilchrist, and the outcome of his observations have been published.

A Marine Laboratory was, as the Members of the Board will be aware, established on a modest scale by the Government of the late Cape Colony, and though of recent years no extensive additions have been possible the Laboratory as it stands is a valuable adjunct in the prosecution of research work which Dr. Gilchrist still carries on.

The subject of Fishing Harbour accommodation is one of wide range, which under present constitutional arrangements lies within the sphere of the Provincial Administration, in so far as improvement of the smaller Fishing Stations is concerned: but in respect to the provision of Harbours entailing the construction of works of magnitude and involving the usual features of Port and Harbour control and the provision of funds upon a large scale, lies within

the/

232

the sphere of the Railways and Harbours Administration of the Union. The position of the Provincial Administration in respect to the interests of the Fishing Industry is, however, such that any representations which it might decide to make would receive most careful consideration. In respect to this subject, certain references which have recently appeared in the Press in the form of a letter from Mr. Lewis of Cape Town are worthy of consideration by the Board, and it is considered that it would be well to arrange to afford Mr. Lewis an opportunity of laying his views before the Board in more complete form - perhaps by way of personal discussion.

In respect to Union Fishing Harbours, works have been carried out by the Provincial Administration at various points, such as Hawston; Gordon's Bay, etc.

In reference to the collection of statistics and the associated subject of the appointment of Fishery Officers at various points upon the Coast Committee, the question of cost has militated against complete realisation of the desires repeatedly expressed by the Board; by the Marine Biological Adviser and equally entertained by the Provincial Administration. As will be noted, later it is proposed to provide for the service of the ensuing year a certain sum of money which, in view of the great importance attached to the re-establishment of a systematic collection of statistics, it is thought, might well be devoted to some extent to this purpose. Whether this particular service (collection of statistics) could not suitably be co-ordinated with certain pro-

posals/

proposals which have been put forward on behalf of the Crayfish Industry, and whether a contribution in cash which has been offered by those interested in that Industry could not advantageously be applied in some measure to the outlay necessary ~~to~~ for the collection of statistics, are matters which, it is trusted, the Board will carefully consider.

The matter of appointing Fishery officers - a question in certain aspects allied to the foregoing subject (collection of statistics) - has been partially dealt with by the employment of one Officer. Enquiry has also been made in reference to the engagement of an expert Officer for general supervision of all outside operations which arise under the Fisheries Ordinance in reference to matters such as are detailed in the Board's letter of 1912, in addition to special expert work connected with the Industry generally. Particulars of the enquiries made will be supplied and the matter will thus be open for further discussion in connection with representations recently received from the Board. It may be well to point out in this connection that treatment of the status and emoluments of officers in the Service of the Department; the disposition of their duties and other matters of administrative and Executive detail are matters which would lie outside of the wider questions connected with the Fishing Industry which would come under the consideration of the Board. Such matters would naturally fall to be treated in the usual manner through the constitutional Executive machinery of the Provincial Administration.

The/

234

The re-commencement of temperature and current observations - commenced by Dr. Gilchrist under the regime of the Cape Government but discontinued owing to financial and other causes - is a matter of importance in the pursuit of the scientific investigations upon which depends much of the research work desirable in the interests of the Fishing Industry.

Various matters intimately affecting the important question of the alleged diminution of the supply of crayfish - upon which depends the well-being of a valuable and growing local industry - have recently engaged the attention of the Board, and several important points raised in recent communications to the Press and in correspondence with various firms connected with the crayfish canning industry will be brought before the Board - for discussion - with the object of arriving at definite proposals for the solution of certain points of primary importance, such as the definition of the fishing seasons and close seasons appropriate to various sections of the coasts of the Province; the preservation of female fish; the delimitation of sanctuaries; institution or artificial Hatcheries; etc.

A number of other items of importance will be found mentioned in the Board's letter of 1912, but reference to these in further detail at the moment would unduly expand this note. It is, however, proposed that such items as may not have been disposed of by administrative action should be discussed by the Board with the object of arriving at definite and finally concerted conclusions for consideration by the Provincial Executive in the light of information and

knowledge/

235

knowledge of facts possessed by various Members.

Of various matters which have more recently come into prominence in connection with the Fishing Industry, the following are items calling for enquiry and consideration of the Board - personal discussion will probably be found desirable in certain instances:-

1. Letters recently published in the local Press by Messrs H.J.C.Stephan and R.S.F.Lewis. These letters deal in more or less general terms with certain matters which it is considered should be fully discussed in person with the gentlemen named.

2. The offer of a cash contribution of £1,000 per annum made by the representative of Companies interested in the Crayfish Canning Industry, with relevent correspondence relating to certain measures proposed for the special protection of that Industry. This subject is connected with recent Resolutions of the Board in reference to the inspection of Cannaries and their products; and the reports furnished by the High Commissioner in London in regard to the Trade Customs and the character of legislation in respect to Government inspection of export foodstuffs and factory products in force in other countries.

3. Proposed interview with Cape Town Chamber of Commerce on the subject of the Crayfish Canning Industry.

4. Reported proposals for employment of trawlers for capture of Crayfish.

5/

236

5. Proposals for allocation of special funds for various purposes connected with the advancement of the Fishing Industry for the year 1916-17.

The amounts available are:-

(1)	£1,000	Special contribution offered by the Crayfish Canning Proprietors.
(2)	£1,300	Investigations, surveys and cost of procuring statistics etc., including boat hire.
	£2,300	

The allocation of the above amount will be a matter apart from the remaining items included in the Estimates for services such as salaries of officers upon the Department's Establishment Grants to Local Societies, etc.

Any allocation recommended by the Board should be in respect to services such as those above-mentioned and discussed in the Board's letter of 1913 - e.g. Collection of Statistics and inspection of Crayfish Canneries, including salaries of officials engaged for these purposes; prosecution of investigations; contingencies such as hire of boats; convict labour; provision for Biological survey with contingent hire of vessels; labour; gear; and so forth.

The total sum likely to be available being less than that upon which the Board based its recent discussion of the proposals set forth in its letter of the 24th February, it will be desirable in respect to each item included in any programme finally recommended to estimate in some detail the probable items of expenditure likely to be involved under subsidiary services.

In/

In respect to Salaries, no allowance will be necessary for officers already in the service of the Department. Provision will be necessary only for additional temporary officers and employes, such as the additional Police (for observation of the operation of Canning Factories) recommended by the Mout Bay Canning Company, and similar ~~serve~~ services.

It may be well to mention that the contribution of $1,000 offered by the Crayfish Canning Factories is a binding undertaking only so far as the current year is concerned, though it is understood that the contributors would be prepared to make the contribution annually, and also to increase the amount.

In respect to these latter points, however, no contract binding upon all contributors has been lodged. In view of this, it will be evident that no new engagements in regard to employment of any person as Fishery Officer, Canning Inspector, or for any of the other duties mentioned by the Board, could be entered into by the Department for a period lower than one year.

Laurie Hammond

9-3/16.

ARK.

(COPY).

Office of the Fishery Advisory Board,

Cape Town, 27th.March 1912.

Suggested Establishment of Department of Fisheries.

Sir,

With reference to an interview which Messrs. W. Runciman, M.L.A., G. Aling, and J.W. Munnik (Secretary), representing the Fishery Advisory Board, had with the Acting Administrator, Mr. Noel Janisch, on the 6th. September last, to emphasize, the necessity of establishing under Provincial Administration a permanent Fisheries Department with the least possible delay, I am now directed by the Board to set forth, in accordance with the wish then expressed by Mr. Janisch, the scope of, and the duties which would devolve upon, such a Department.

Before entering upon this task it may not be out of place to briefly review the present position of the Fishing Industry in the Cape Province.

The industry has existed from the earliest occupation of the country and has been carried on in a perfunctory manner principally by the Malays and coloured classes. In those days fish was obtained in abundance within a few yards of the coast and it was only necessary to employ small boats for the purpose. This class of boat is still most generally used and, although the conditions in regard to the facilities have changed in that the boats must now go out a considerable distance from the shore, the conservative character of the fishermen urge them to adhere to the old class of boat, and consequently it is only in fine

weather/

able the Administrator of the
Cape of Good Hope,
CAPE TOWN.

weather that they are useful. During the past three to four years a larger class of boat with more modern appliances,, manned by Italians, has been employed and is gradually superseding the old boats used by the Cape Fishermen, but still the Italian boats are very crude and not at all suitable for the purpose.

Very little interest was taken in the industry until the year 1897 when the late Cape Government at the instance of Sir Pieter Faure, who was then Minister of Agriculture, purchased and equipped a small steamer as a trawler to exploit the fishing possibilities of the coast and appointed Dr. J.D.F. Gilchrist as Marine Biologist to conduct the research work. The result was a great success and vast fishing grounds were discovered. This was soon taken advantage of by private enterprise and several steam trawlers were imported and are still employed in various Fishing Centres, thereby adding enormously to the food supply of the country.

In addition to this, the employment of the steamer gave Dr. Gilchrist an opportunity to conduct his scientific investigations into the fauna and flora of the sea, and he has during the few years that it was at his disposal obtained most valuable information in regard to the various species of fish in our waters, their habits and life history, seasons of migration and spawning.

The necessity for the establishment of a proper Fisheries Department to regulate and foster the development of the industry cannot be too strongly insisted upon. The industry is one of the chief assets of the Cape Province and deserves every possible encouragement as its expansion will not only ameliorate the conditions of life of the local seaboard population by offering employment

to/

to a larger number of men, but will also ensure the supply of a cheap and wholesome food to a much larger number of the inhabitants of South Africa.

It may not be out of place to give a synopsis of the exportation of fish (inland and oversea) from the Cape Province and the importation of fish into British South Africa during 1909, which are the latest figures at the Board's disposal at the moment.

(A) Removals to Inland Colonies:

(1) Dried:

	lb.	£	
Transvaal	102,007	1,629	
Orange Free State	11,746	150	
S.Rhodesia	39,994	570	(estimated).

(2) Fresh or Frozen:

Transvaal	5,107,919	71,924
Orange Free State	450,581	5,581
S. Rhodesia	173,516	2,531
Basutoland	165	3
Bechuanaland	226	8

(3) Preserved:

Transvaal	19,334	180
Orange Free State	7,912	197
S.Rhodesia	1,522	46
Bechuanaland	144	3
Swaziland	60	2
N.W.Rhodesia	893	23
Bechuanaland	463	15
	5,916,482 lb.	£82,862.

(B) Exports (Oversea):

(1) Dried	1,359,738	15,394
(2) Fresh or Frozen	979	29
(3) Preserved	837,671	19,433
	2,198,388 lb.	£33,056

(C) Imports into British South Africa:

(1) Dried or cured	2,375,010	32,219
(2) Fresh or Frozen	52,863	1,501
(3) Preserved	5,412,246	147,822
	7,840,119	181,542

Total Exports from Cape Province during 1909:

8,114,870 lb. £115,918.

Total Imports into British South Africa during 1909:

7,840,119 lb. £181,542.

These/

These figures speak eloquently for themselves. The yearly importation of about 4,000 tons of fish food, when our own waters are teeming with fish, is a grave reflection on the apathy of past administrations in neglecting to take any interest or adopt any means to reap the harvest at our doors; and it is to be hoped that with an awakening to the vast possibilities that lie in the fishing industry a real and effective Fisheries Department will be established, fully equipped and financed to carry out experimental and investigational work of a scientific, commercial or other nature.

For this purpose, the first and most important step would be the appointment of the principal officer, who should possess recognised scientific knowledge and sufficient practical experience of the fishing industries in other countries.

The following are some of the most important matters that would require his attention:-

Fishery Survey: It is very desirable and necessary to proceed with the survey of new fishing grounds and especially those of the Agulhas Bank. Theysurvey work already done, but suspended through lack of funds, has resulted in the opening up of large fishing areas on the Agulhas Bank. Trawlers have come from Europe, and not only about doubled the supply of ordinary fish but have practically supplied the whole of South Africa with soles, which were formerly scarcely to be had. There are many upcountry towns and villages in South Africa as yet badly supplied with fish, and there is good reason for believing that the fishing area, especially on the Agulhas Bank, is more extensive than is supposed. As a preliminary step

some/

some progress could be made by the hire of a small steamer for a short time.

Scientific Investigations: The framing of proper regulations as to the size limit, close season, etc., of fish is frequently dependent on the results of scientific investigations into their habits, condition, etc., and it is necessary that such enquiries should be actively carried on to meet the existing difficulties and others that are constantly arising. With an increased demand for fish and extended fishing operations the necessity for keeping a check on destructive and wasteful methods of fishing becomes greater. The greatest difficulty is experienced in getting reliable data as to the spawning season and habits of the crawfish, geelbeck, snoek, mackerel and other South African fishes in order to frame proper fishery regulations. One has but to mention the Kowie, East London, Zwartkops and Knysna disputes, where the destruction or otherwise of spawn and young fish by certain methods of fishing is still under consideration. Research, to be successful, must be continuous. Much has still to be learnt regarding the habits and life history of our food fish, and it is only by scientific investigations that the practical side of our fishing industry can be developed. It is therefore to be regretted that the late Cape Government failed to recognise the importance of this work and withdrew from the Estimates the necessary funds to carry it on.

A Marine Laboratory is absolutely necessary to carry on in an efficient and satisfactory manner the investigational work above referred to. Previous investigations at the Marine Laboratory, St. James, enabled in-

formation/

formation to be obtained in regard to certain fish, but much remains to be done.

Harbour Accomodation: One of the most important factors necessary for the future development of the Industry is the matter of harbour accomodation. For years past the condition of affairs in the various fishing localities in False Bay brought about by the falling off and great scarcity of fish in the immediate neighbourhood of the coast has rendered the employment of the small boats inadequate. It has been found necessary in False Bay to employ steam tugs to tow the boats far out to sea, where the fishing grounds are now chiefly to be found. This method of fishing cannot continue as it is much too dangerous, but the fishermen are compelled to use these small boats on account of the absence of harbour accomodation.

The same want is felt in Table Bay. Only recently a large and influentially signed petition from the fishermen was addressed to the Government complaining bitterly of the want of accomodation for their boats, and the industry is seriously retarded through the absence of harbour accomodation.

The Board is strongly of opinion and would urge the Government to take into serious consideration the urgent necessity of constructing accomodation to meet the requirements of the fishing industry.

Special mention should be made of the position at Kalk Bay, where the condition of the fishermen is year by year becoming worse. This is to a great extent due to the action of the Cape Government in the construction of the Railway to Simonstown. In building the line the Government encroached upon the beach which had been used

from/

from time immemorial for beaching the boats. The beach owing to the Railway Viaduct has gradually disappeared and there is now no adequate accomodation for the boats. A harbour here is the only solution to relieve the condition of these poor fishermen.

Statistics: The collection of statistics is most essential to a proper appreciation of the progress or decline of the fishing industry, and consequently the manner in which it could be controlled or improved; and for this purpose statistics should be obtained from all the fishing stations along the coast. Without such information any attempt to improve or regulate the industry can only be attempted with difficulty.

Appointment of Fishery Officers: Fishery Officers should be appointed at the different fishing stations and they should inspect nets, etc., see to the enforcement of the regulations, submit reports from time to time on the condition of the stations under their supervision, and also prepare the statistics above referred to. At the present time there is almost a complete absence of inspection of nets as was shown recently when it was found that a whole community was fishing with illegal nets, and probably seriously affecting the fish supply by wholesale destruction of immature fish. In the same way, most of the other fishing regulations have been practically a dead letter. In addition to the Fishery Officers, there should also be a Chief Fishery Officer, who should now and then visit the different stations and furnish reports on the results of his inspections.

Temperature and Current Observations: These are greatly needed in connection with questions as to the migration and movements of fish. An enquiry in regard thereto was started by Dr. Gilchrist when Marine Biologist,

and/

and should be restarted as early as possible. 245

Necessity forprotection of Crawfish Industry: Chiefly on account of the establishment of new factories this is becoming an important matter. The Board has had repeated evidence from fishermen and factories that the supply of crawfish is diminishing, and the present regulations seem inadequate. Here again, the Board is without sufficient data and without the means to institute a thorough enquiry into the cause of the falling off of the supply. One difficulty is that the spawning season appears to differ in different localities and is not sufficiently well known in any. The work can only be satisfactorily carried out by independent investigation at different places and continued observation on the living animals in a suitable marine laboratory. The present condition of the Lobster industry in America and Canada, where the lobster has almost ceased to exist, is a warning of what will happen in South Africa unless measures are adopted to protect the Crawfish industry.

The value of the Crawfish industry will be better understood by the following approximate figures of export for 1910 and 1911:-

1910	813,068 lb.
1911	1,176,885 lb.

Cape Oyster Industry: The same remarks as above apply to the Cape Oyster, the supply of which is diminishing and at some localities has ceased altogether. A check should be made to this by suitable regulations for its protection and endeavours at artificial cultivation as in other countries.

Acclimatisation of fish: The progress in the work of acclimatising trout and other fish is being hampered for want of funds. No inspection of rivers to enquire

into/

into the progress being made or to introduce the fish into new waters has been possible. Other Colonies are directing attention to the acclimatisation of valuable fish and shellfish, and experiments in this direction could be readily carried out in the Cape.

Establishment of an Aquarium and Fisheries Museum The need of an up-to-date Aquarium is much felt, while a Museum containing specimens of all the different kinds of implements, nets, etc., used in fishing, and approved by law, would be of great advantage.

Supervision over sale and distribution of fish: A large amount of fish is at present sent to Mauritius and elsewhere in a state unfit for human consumption with eventual serious consequences to the export trade. The method of transport by cart from house to house is often questionable. The carts are frequently in a dirty condition, often times the fish lie uncovered for hours and is subjected to rough handling. They are sometimes "painted" and recured, and it is only by constant and diligent supervision and getting the offenders punished that any improvement can be expected.

Supervision of Fishmarkets and Curing Stations:

(a) Proper handling and cleaning of fish.

(b) Proper storage.

(c) Examination of fish by Government Officials prior to exportation.

(d) Reporting of unwholesome fish.

Whaling Industry: The effects of whaling on the fishing industry requires serious attention.

Salt: An enquiry should also be instituted into the production of Cape salt and its suitability for curing purposes.

Numbering/

Numbering and Licensing of Boats: This matter requires immediate attention.

Enforcing of Regulations:

Best methods of Catching Fish on a commercial scale:

Railway Rates: The Railway rates were recently at the representations of the Board reduced but, in comparison with other South African produce, the cost of transport is still high and seriously militates against the development of the industry. A further reduction, so as to ensure upcountry people getting fish at a reasonable charge, is much desired.

In conclusion, the Board would like to point out that the country is spending about £1,000,000 per annum in the administration and development of its agricultural resources, and that it is therefore not too much to expect a few thousand pounds per annum to be earmarked for exploiting the mine of wealth in our seas, especially when the resulting benefits would be of such immense importance to the country.

It would of course be absurd to draw a comparison between the possibilities of a Fishing Industry at the Cape and that of Great Britain, but it is interesting and instructive to note what has been achieved in Great Britain during the past fifty years by the establishment of a proper Department of Fisheries. Prior to that little or no attention had been paid to the industry and it was comparatively very small. Owing, however, to strong representations in the British Parliament, principally by Scottish Members, the Government was compelled to direct attention to the regulation, conduct and protection of the industry, and the result has been marvellous. In 1903,

there/

there were 27,000 vessels, manned by 90,000 fishermen, engaged in Great Britain, and the quantity of fish handled was 900,000 tons, valued at over £10,000,000.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

(Sgd:) J.W.Munnik.

Secretary to the Fishery Advisory Board.

Minutes of Meeting of Fishery Advisory Board, held on at Huguenot Buildings, on Friday, the 17th March, 1916.

Present: Mr Mansergh (Chairman), Dr Gilchrist, and Messrs Runciman, Van Zyl, Irvin, Stephan, J. G. Reid, and A. H. Reid.

Minutes of last Meeting were confirmed.

CRAWFISH INVESTIGATIONS.

Dr Gilchrist submitted the following programme in connection with the proposed Crawfish Investigations:-

(a) Continuation of hauls at various localities to ascertain time of spawning, when in sick condition, etc.

(b) Making experiments to ascertain if Crawfish migrate from one place to another and how far, showing whether fishing at one place will injure other places.

(c) Investigations into possibility of rearing Crawfish as in the case of the Lobster.

(d) Ascertaining the rate of growth of Crawfish; at what size they are mature (i.e. capable of carrying eggs).

(e) Relative necessity of protecting sexes. Can one male fertilize many females: if so, more important to further protect females than to have a close season for protecting sick males.

Mr Stephan raised the point whether rearing of Crawfish in waters of Muizenberg, where Crawfish are not found, would permit of correct inferences of general application.

Dr Gilchrist explained that it would be simply for the purpose of studying the early stages. Experiments in practical rearing of Crawfish must be as near the true venue of Crawfish as possible (for instance, Table Bay).

ESTIMATES, 1916 - 1917; Proposals for Special Investigations, etc.

Mr Mansergh intimated that since the last Meeting, Dr Gilchrist and he had considered the question of the

allocations

allocations agreed upon at the last Meeting and, as a result thereof, Dr Gilchrist had suggested the following amendments which would provide for a useful practical programme of work for the year.

I. Statistics.....£500.

II. Crawfish Investigations:

(a) Assistants (for hatching, experimental hauls, etc.).....£300.

(b) Equipment (nets, bottles, instruments, etc.).....£100.

(c) Hire of boats and labour£200.£600.

III. Fishery Investigations:

(a) Assistants (Officers in IIa).

(b) Hire of boats, etc.....£150.

(c) Equipment, working out of temperature observations, drawings, etc.....£150.£300.

IV. Marine Biological Station:

Purchase of specimens, wages of Attendant, etc.....£200.

V. Additional Inspectors.....£300.

VI. Police Supervision.....£400.

£2,300.

In regard to item VI., Mr Mansergh stated that he had communicated with the Sub-Inspector of Police, and had been informed that, while the Police would be quite prepared to assist in securing observance of the Fishery Regulations, the question of an honorarium for the men would probably not be entertained by the Department of Justice.

In this event, the £400 allocated to "Police Supervision" could be usefully added to the item "Crawfish Investigations", making the total under that Heading £1,000.

In

In reply to Mr A. H. Reid, Mr Mansergh agreed that, in this event, any moneys which might be required for payment of Police could come out of the £400.

Dr Gilchrist doubted whether the sum of £300 (item IIa) for two men to assist in general fishery investigations would be sufficient, as it might become necessary to engage the services of a competent man with an intimate knowledge of the Lobster Industry.

Mr Mansergh pointed out that the idea was to allocate the funds to experiments for twelve months only. It was also necessary to bear in mind that the Administrator would probably not at the present time approve of importing an Expert, who would probably require at least a three years' contract.

Mr Stephan stated that he had recently engaged the services of a man from America, who was thoroughly acquainted with the Lobster Industry, and that his services and experience could be utilized by Dr Gilchrist, when necessary.

Arising out of the discussion in respect to the Crawfish Industry, Messrs J. G. Reid and Stephan expressed the opinion that the three areas in force before the latest Proclamation(No. 50 of 1914) were the most accurate yet determined. Area 1 (Cape ~~Mann~~ Point to Duiker Point) and Area 2 (Duiker Point to Columbine Point) were correct to within a fortnight. The introduction of Area No. 3 (Duiker Point to Matroos Point) had seriously handicapped Canners. The re-arrangement of Seasons caused by its introduction had been very inaccurate.

Mr J. G. Reid pointed out that North of Cape Columbine the present close season extends to 15th April, yet he had received a report (which he read) stating that Crawfish have been in good condition since the 13th March.

Mr

unsatisfactory, the question of supervision could be considered.

Dr Gilchrist intimated that he had submitted a scientific report on Crawfish to the Linnaeum Society but, owing to the abnormal times, its publication had not been possible. The Board approved of £30 being voted from the amount allocated to Crawfish Investigations to the printing of the report; Dr Gilchrist to make the necessary arrangements and to secure copies for distribution among Members of the Board, Crawfish Canners, etc.

The reasting of the Estimates in terms of the discussion, subject to reservations in regard to items V and VI., as above indicated, resulted as follows:-

I. Statistics	£500.
II. Crawfish Investigations	£1000.
III. General Fishery Investigations	£300.
IV. Marine Biological Station	£200.
AMOUNT IN RESERVE	£300
	£2,300.

CRAWFISH: SUGGESTIONS RE PROTECTION, etc: Hout Bay Canning Co.

Mr Manserghxxxxxxxx read a letter,* dated the 12th February, 1916, from Mr Plessis, on behalf of the above Company.

Mr J. G. Reid stated that most of the recommendations were not acceptable to the Canners, and that there was want of unanimity among Canners in regard to (a) Total prohibition of fishing and capture of small Crawfish under present regulation size at any time or in any place, and for any purpose or reason whatever, including

* Copy appended.

unsatisfactory, the question of supervision could be considered.

Dr Gilchrist intimated that he had submitted a scientific report on Crawfish to the Linnaeum Society but, owing to the abnormal times, its publication had not been possible. The Board approved of £30 being voted from the amount allocated to Crawfish Investigations to the printing of the report; Dr Gilchrist to make the necessary arrangements and to secure copies for distribution among Members of the Board, Crawfish Canners, etc.

The reasting of the Estimates in terms of the discussion, subject to reservations in regard to items V and VI., as above indicated, resulted as follows:-

I. Statistics	£500.
II. Crawfish Investigations	£1000.
III. General Fishery Investigations	£300.
IV. Marine Biological Station	£200.
AMOUNT IN RESERVE	£300
	£2,300.

CRAWFISH: SUGGESTIONS RE PROTECTION, etc: Hout Bay Canning Co.

Mr Manserghxxxxxxxx read a letter*, dated the 12th February, 1916, from Mr Plessis, on behalf of the above Company.

Mr J. G. Reid stated that most of the recommendations were not acceptable to the Canners, and that there was want of unanimity among Canners in regard to (a) Total prohibition of fishing and capture of small Crawfish under present regulation size at any time or in any place, and for any purpose or reason whatever, including

* Copy appended.

including use for bait; and (b) Total prohibition of fishing and capture of all crawfish during close seasons, whether intended for bait or not. All were in favour of a varying close season and also that the close season should be for a period of four months (c)

In regard to the suggestion for a compulsory rendering of Monthly Returns (h), Mr Mansergh stated that this could be arranged for under the present Regulations, and that he proposed to take the necessary steps. Mr Reid suggested Quarterly Returns as more suitable and involving less trouble. Mr Stephan concurred. Mr Mansergh promised to arrange accordingly.

SNOEK.

In respect to the capture of undersized Snoek, the item upon which the last meeting of the Board, had been adjourned, Mr Mansergh pointed out that the present Regulations prohibited the catching of Snoek under 24 inches. The practical difficulty was that"small" and "large" Snoek were caught in the same shoals, and that it seemed wasteful to throw the undersized ones away. If the large ones arrived at a different time to the small ones, a close season could be arranged. There was constant pressure for a reduction in the size limit, but Dr Gilchrist was opposed to any reduction.

Dr Gilchrist stated that the size limit was fixed long before his arrival at the Cape. In his opinion, Snoek of 24" were not altogether mature.

In the discussion that followed, Mr Stephan stated that he had evidence that Snoek came South to spawn in June month. In August, quantities of spawn could be found. Small fry were caught in millions. If the fishermen at Hermanus and Kalk Bay were allowed to continue

to

to catch small Snoek it would lead to the extermination of the fish. He agreed with Dr Gilchrist that Snoek of 24" were not mature, and considered that the size limit should be raised to 28". He admitted however that it would lead to considerable hardship among fishermen, and that this was a point that should receive consideration. He pointed out that no small Snoek came from the Northern parts of the Coast (a view shared by Mr Irvin) and was of opinion that the small Snoek remained in more Southerly waters to keep away from the large Snoek until they also were full grown. The difficulty to be faced was two-fold: if the size limit were increased to 28" to prevent the catching of immature fish, the livelihood of a number of fishermen would be seriously jeopardized: on the other hand, if this be not done, the result would be the extermination of the Snoek.

Mr Runciman agreed with Mr Stephan that years ago the Snoek caught were much larger than the ones seen nowadays.

Mr Irvin considered the position serious as larger proportions of Snoek caught is "small"; and Mr Stephan placed the percentage of small ones caught near 75.

In reply to Mr Runciman, Mr Stephan stated that it was a fallacy that Snoek caught and thrown back into the sea would die. This would only happen if the hook reachdd the brain. He also pointed out that Snoek is at its best when in spawn, and became "bad" after spawning; so that the extermination of Snoek is also helped on by catching them when in good condition. He suggested a heavy penalty on buyers who accepted Snoek under the legal size limit.

Dr Gilchrist desired more information before coming to a decision, and the scattered ends of available information collected and tabulated.

Mr

Mr Mansergh promised to cause the information available to be tabulated, and then to submit the papers to Dr Gilchrist. He was anxious for a recommendation from the Board: should the Administration proceed on a campaign of prosecution for catching Snoek under the present size limit, and cause a great commotion among the fishermen with its resultant petitions.

Eventually it was decided that Dr Gilchrist should commence Investigations in regard to the age of Maturity, etc., of Snoek; and that, in the meantime, the regulation in regard to size limit should be strictly enforced.

DEAD CRAWFISH ON CLANWILLIAM COAST.

Mr Mansergh read a statement to the effect that Mr Tucker Shaw, of the Audit Office, had ten days ago seen thousands of dead Crawfish washing up on the shores of Clanwilliam. The seawater, which was reddish in appearance, had a very noxious smell, and contained innumerable small feathers. Mr J. G. Reid mentioned that a similar occurrence took place at Lambert's Bay about fourteen years ago.

Mr J. G. Reid moved that samples of the water be obtained and submitted for analysis. This was agreed to, and Mr Mansergh promised to wire at once to the Magistrate of Clanwilliam on the subject.

MR DANEEL'S RESIGNATION.

In reply to a wish from the Board that he should reconsider his resignation, Mr Daneel replied that he extremely regretted that he found it impossible to do so. The Secretary was instructed to acknowledge Mr Daneel's letter with an expression of thanks for his past services and of regret that he was unable to reconsider his resignation.

J. W. Munnik,
Secretary.

CONFIRMED.
Chairman. 20.4.16

FY).

Hout Bay Canning Co. Ltd.,
Hout Bay, 12th. February 1916.

H.H. the Administrator,
of the Cape Province,
Wale Street, Cape Town.

Sir,

Fisheries Ordinance.

With reference to the Deputation of Canners of Crayfish which waited upon you on the 2nd. instant on the subject of the necessity for the provision of more adequate regulations for the better protection of the Crayfish Industry, and to the willingness you then expressed to give favourable consideration to any recommendations we might offer for the better preservation of Crayfish, we beg to submit the following suggestions which we think will help materially to ameliorate the existing condition of affairs.

Amendments to Regulations.

We propose that the existing Regulations should be amended to include the following, viz:-

(a) The total prohibition of the fishing and capture of small Crayfish under present regulation size at any time or in any place, and for any purpose or reason whatever, including use for bait.

(b) The total prohibition of the fishing and capture of all Crayfish during the Close Seasons, whether intended for bait or not.

(c)/

(c) The Administrator to be empowered to advance or delay the Close Season as at present fixed to meet the varying periods of incubation in the different waters, the period of Close Season to be Four Calendar Months from the date of the Closing of the previous Fishing Season.

(d) The licensing of all fishermen, vendors of Crayfish, Canners and other persons directly interested in the Crayfish Industry.

(e) The prohibition of the landing of Crayfish intended for sale except at recognised Fishmarkets, Factories engaged in the Crayfish Industry, on other places where public surveillance is possible.

(f) The enforcement of heavy fines on all Factories, Hotels, eating-houses, cafes, restaurants, fish shops and other places and persons (except fishermen, who should be repeatedly fined in small amounts to be deducted from their earnings) convicted of receiving, purchasing or of being in possession of undersized Crayfish and Crayfish in berry at any time, or of all fresh caught Crayfish during the Close Seasons.

(g) The total prohibition of the use of trawls or trawler fishing for Crayfish.

(h) All Canners to be compelled to make monthly Returns of the Crayfish received by them, and for this purpose to keep a Record Book in which daily entries must be made showing

(1) Date of capture,
(2) Total number of large Crayfish,
(3) Total number of small Crayfish,
(4) Estimated percentage of females,
(5) Weather conditions,
and (6) Remarks as to the condition of the Crayfish,

such Record Book to be kept at the disposal of the Fishing Officer or his assistants for inspection from time to time.

General Remarks.

We think that the above proposals are sufficiently explicit in themselves to require few if any comments thereon; but with regard to (c) we would like to add that our experience - and we believe it is the experience of other canners also - is that there is no actual fixed date in the year at which Crayfish can be said to commence to spawn. Observation has fixed the approximate periods as at present regulated by the Close Seasons, but it sometimes happens that the actual date of incubation is a fortnight or more in advance of the Close Season, or is delayed until well into the Close Season. For these reasons it is therefore advisable to have an adjustable Close Season. The information provided by item (6) of the Record Book advocated in (h) will be found of material assistance in fixing the date of the Close Season each year.

Recommendations (d) and (e) are essential for the protection of the industry, as the Provincial Administration will thus have more control over the persons engaged in the industry than they have at present.

The need for (f) is so apparent to anyone familiar with the menus of the Cape Town Hotels during the Close Season that further comment is superfluous.

So far back as 1899 and 1903 the Dominion Government of Canada found it necessary to prohibit the use of trawls for Lobster Fishing in certain areas under its control, penalising breaches of the regulations by fines of 100 dollars and costs or imprisonment not exceeding three months, accompanied by liability to confiscation of vessels, boats and fishing gear illegally used. Under these circumstances, and in view of the perilous state of the Crayfish Industry in this country, our recommendation (g) is most important. We believe that no more destruc-

tive/

tive agency for the wholesale extermination of Crayfish than the permission to use trawls for Crayfish Fishing can be devised, and the experience of other countries engaged in the lobster industry apparently confirms our belief. We base our arguments upon three sound foundations, viz:-

(a) That trawling for Crayfish must necessarily break up the Crayfish beds in a way that does not obtain with the use of the small nets at present employed.

(b) That trawling over clear ground or sandy bottom will result in the extermination of the very fish which the Regulations are framed to protect mostly, as our experience as the pioneers of the Crayfish Canning Industry in this country has shown us that when Crayfish near their period of incubation they desert the rocky coast for clear water, and it is in the clear water that we have found that female in berry and soft shell fish congregate.

(c) That the weight of the large number of Crayfish which a trawl net will bear leaves no possible opportunity for the escape from destruction of small fish, female in berry and soft shell fish.

As it was the expressed desire of the Canners who waited upon you to do all in their power to conserve the Crayfish Industry, we think that the recommendations we have made above will meet with practically the unanimous approval of those having the welfare of the industry at heart, and to those who still have doubts as to the wisdom or the desirability of enforcing any of the recommendations we have embodied herein we would suggest a perusal of the Report of the Dominion of Canada Shell-Fish Fishery Commission, 1912-1913, which will be found most advantageous.

For,

For the policing arrangements, we favour contributing a sum on the £ for £ principle with the Administration for obtaining the co-operation of the Police Force to watch all places where Crayfish are landed. We would suggest that no special police should be employed for this purpose, but that the Commandant should be asked to detail men from time to time to watch daily the Factories, Fish-markets and other places where Crayfish are permitted to be landed, and at the Factories to check the Record Books recommended in (h). The cost of this policing would be met by the Canners and the Administration jointly. The employment of a patrol boat or patrol boats would, in our opinion, be of little use, entailing far more expense for upkeep than would be commensurate with the benefits the industry would derive therefrom. So long as protected fish are not allowed to be landed - and this can be ensured by the employment of policemen as we have suggested - and fishermen are fined frequently in small amounts for each and every contravention of the regulations, so that the fines can be met out of their earnings, and they themselves therefore feel the pinch, we are convinced that patrol boats will be unnecessary. Frequent contraventions of the regulations would, of course, be met by refusal to renew licences.

We trust that careful consideration will be given to our recommendations, and that Regulations will be promulgated as early as possible on the basis we have laid down. We shall be only too willing to give every assistance and information we can to secure this end.

We are, Sir,
Yours faithfully,
HOUT BAY CANNING CO.LTD.,
(Sgd:) H.Plessis.
Managing Director.

CC.

Minutes of Meeting of Fishery Advisory Board held on Thursday, the 20th April, 1916.

PRESENT: Mr Mansergh (Chairman), Dr Gilchrist, and Messrs Runciman, A.H. Reid, Stephan, and J.G. Reid

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING, after a slight addition at the request of Mr Stephan had been made, were confirmed.

(1) a. Dead trout found at Stellenbosch by Mr A. H. Reid.

b. Dr Gilchrist's report on fish procured from stomach of Rainbow trout and supposed to be young trout.

Mr Mansergh read the following report from Dr Robertson, the Government Bacteriologist, in regard to (a):-

"I am unable to discover any pathological changes in these trout to account for their death. They had evidently fed very shortly before dying as their stomachs were full of recently swallowed small fish, insects, etc".

and added that , as the alcohol in which the trout had been preserved would probably have caused the death of many germs, Dr Robertson was somewhat handicapped in his examination.

Dr Gilchrist, in reply to Mr A. H. Reid, stated that the gills of fish are widely distended when death is due to foul water: this may be due to suffocation.

(2) Statement shewing amounts derived from Trout fishing, Fishing boats, Whaling and Oyster Licences during 1913-14, and 1914-15.

Passed for record.

(3) Improvements to Hawston Fishing Harbour.

It was decided to circulate among members the correspondence on the above subject received from the Provincial Secretary.

(4) Table Bay Fishing Harbour.

Plan of Harbour received from the Private Secretary to the Minister of Railways and Harbours was submitted by the Chairman.

Mr

Mr J. G. Reid remarked that two strong objections to the Harbour were:- (1) The Railway obstruction from the land side; and (2) The serious danger of boats capsizing on approaching the entrance in a strong 'South-Easter'.

Ultimately Mr J. G. Reid moved:-"That in view of representations of certain defects in connection with the constructionm of the Harbour that have reached the Board, the Minister of Railways and Harbours be asked to permit Col. Nicholson to attend a meeting of the Board at an early date for the purpose of fully discussing the matter".

Agreed to.

(5) Capture of undersized Crawfish at Paternoster: report of Fishery Officer.

Mrm Stephan stated that the matter of faulty lights used by his factories when crawfish are landed in the evening had been rectified. He submitted the following report from his Manager, Mr Lord, in regard to the allegation that under sized crawfish were being caught:-

"I have received your enquiry for information concerning catches of crawfish delivered to our Canneries at Paternoster and Steenberg's Covem during the past three weeks, and in reply I beg to advise that from March 27th to April 15th our total catches were 1,068,164, which number of fish made 404,480 cans, or an average of 2.64 fish per each can. These figures certainly shew that our catches have been on the small side, but I certainly resent the insinuation that we have been packing undersized fish. There is a considerable difference between the two expressions, but I do not wish to add anything further: the figures speak more clearly than anything I can say. Of course, it is possible with such unprecedented catches of fish that one or two undersized fish may have slipped into the factory, but I take the strongest exception to

any

any suggestions made by you, or the Fishery Offi cer, that we are packing, noticeably, undersized fish. I would further point out that I cannot see where the Factories can do more than we have been doing. We certainly do not accept under-sized fish, and if the fishermen do not sort out the fish on the fishing grounds, we ourselves, when the boats arrive at the landing places, sort them out, and the fishermen have to take the small ones back to where they brought them ~~back~~ from. I personally gave this definite order to the fishermen the last time I was down at the Factories and, in carryying out my instructions, the Manager of the Factory last week was savage-ly attacked by several fishermen, and had his head cut open. Two or three others of the staff were also thrown into the water, and really, bearing in mind that we are dealing with uneduca" ted fishermen, I do not see where we could possi-bly exercise more influence than we are doing at the present time. It does not pay us to accept undersized fish...".

Mr J. G. Reid read a letter from the Manager of the North Bay Canning Co., in which the writer stated that the firm was anxious to procure large fish but that, owing to the fishermen being paid for fish at the rate of every hundred caught, they were more concerned in catching crawfish just over the legal limit so as to increase the carrying capacity of the boats. He considered that Factories should be called upon to render returns as to the average number of fish per case.

Mr Stephan again emphasized the need of increasing the penalty so far as Factories were concerned for catching

undersized

undersized crawfish, so that the fine could act as a strong deterrent to Managers of Factories who may desire to infringe the regulations.

Mr Mansergh promised to get a report from the Magistrate as to what emerged at the evidence in the trial of several fishermen from Paternoster, etc., for catching undersized crawfish so as to ascertain whether the Factory Managers were in any way to blame. He promised, on behalf of the Administration, to keep a close hand on any infringements of the regulations and to initiate prosecutions where necessary.

(6) Crawfish: Mr Mansergh's memorandum for the Fishery Advisory Board in reference to the protection of.

Mr Runciman moved the following reply to the memorandum (see annexure to these minutes):-

"The Board desires to express its appreciation of the Provincial Secretary's review of the deliberations and recommendations by the Board in connection with the Crawfish Industry, and to offer the following reply to his comments:-

Suggested areas for Close Seasons in 1914: it is said that the Board made definite recommendations for three areas which were adopted by Proclamation on 5th March,1914, and yet hardly fifteen months afterwards, in the face of the full enquiry which led them to such recommendation, a fourth area is recommended.

On reference to the letter from the Board of the 28th February, 1914, it will be seen that the Board distinctly expressed their opinion that more information was required,

and

and that their "recommendations are in a measure tentative".

With regard to the comments on the Board's recommendation to agree to the request made by the Magistrate of Hopefield for the extension of three weeks in Area No. 3, it should be observed that the Board was careful to make it a condition that approval was subject to the Fishery Officer being satisfied that the condition of the fish was fit for canning.

The Board is perfectly alive to the apparent inconsistency of their action, but such inconsistence may continually arise until such time as investigations of the habits of the Crawfish have been fully established. It should be remembered that the Industry is only in its infancy, and that the Government has unfortunately been unable, from want of funds, to carry out the necessary investigations as recommended by the Board. Until such have been carried out, it would be unwise to set up a rigid code of regulations.

It may chance that the Factories of No. 4 Area may ask for similar considerations, in which event it may have the advantage of bringing about further investigations and more reliable data on which to carry on the Industry; and until then, there can be no fixity in determining the seasons of any of the areas.

Complaints and appeals for re-adjustment may possibly continue, and all such should be dealt with on their merits. The time has not arrived for an analogy to be made in respect to a close season for "Game" and its application to Crawfish, as the facts in regard to the latter are not established.

Other important matters, which have been referred to by the Chairman, such as

(1) special areas in which fishing may be entirely prohibited;

(2) establishment of hatcheries,

have engaged the attention of the Board, and these, together with the still more important question of migration, the periods of such, and the limitations of supply, accentuate the necessity for continuous and scientific investi-

ion.

So far, the Board has been unable to obtain any relia-

information as to the diminution of supply. In such

ces as Table Bay, where the natural resorts have been

turbed apparently by traffic and pollution, there is

oubtedly a serious falling off; but, in other areas,

ere the natural conditions exist, there is no evidence

diminution; and, in order to ascertain the true posi-

tion, investigation is necessary before it is too late".

Mr J. G. Reid, in seconding, expressed himself as cordially in agreement with the views of Mr Runciman.

Mr Mansergh trusted that the members will not think that in submitting the memorandum, he sought in any way to depreciate the good work done by the ~~work~~ Board. His object was to give the members a bird's eye view of what has been done up to the present. For instance, up to the present, he has neither seen nor heard the reasons which actuated the Board in suggesting the four areas for Crawfish now in existence.

Mr Runciman said that members quite realized that. In submitting the reply he simply desired to accentuate the Board's wish for further information. He had confidence that with the re-constitution of tha Board and the presence

of

of the Provincial Secretary as Chairman, the Board would become a real live body and do much useful work.

The reply was agreed to.

(7) Proposed deputation from the Cape Town Chamber of Commerce for the purpose of discussing matters pertaining to Crawfish Industry.

Mr.Mansergh promised to prepare a memorandum in reply to the communication from the Chamber of Commerce, (annexure to these minutes) and to circulate it among the members of the Board for any suggestions they may desire to make.

Omission under item (1) Trout.

Mr.Mansergh stated that two samples of water taken by Mr.A.H.Reid at Stellenbosch had been submitted to the Government Analyst for the purpose of ascertaining whether the river suffered from pollution owing to the discharge into it of sewage or effluences from factories.

J. W. Mannik.

Secretary.

CONFIRMED.

CHAIRMAN.

5/5/16

Crayfish : Memorandum for the Fisheries Advisory Board in reference to protection of :

With reference to the recent discussions of the Board in reference to the alleged diminution of the supply of Crayfish, the seasons for fishing, and the seasons for protection, and the Board's desire that sepcial investigation should take place as to facts which bear upon these points; it will be convenient for all members to be placed in possession of the accompanying letter dated 28th February 1914 which crystalises the result of an exhaustive enquiry made by the Board at which a considerable volume of evidence was taken.

The questions in point were also dealt with in the Board's Report for the year 1913, of which members possess copies.

In so far as the matter of appropriate fishing and close seasons is concerned, it will be seen from these documents that after the exhaustive enquiry referred to, the Board arrived at a certain series of areas (3) to each of which certain dates for the opening and closing of fishing seasons were assigned.

It must also be borne in mind that for a long time the accepted period in each year for the close season has been four months.

The three areas and the date last mentioned were adopted and duly gazetted in Proclamation No. 50 dated the 5th March 1914.

At this point it may be of interest to compare the dates thus selected with the dates which since 1906 have been applied to the fishing and close seasons vide Statement A. attached.

It will be observed that the Board in 1914 with all the information before it and having specially taken evidence from the majority of -- if not from all -- interested sections of the community, maintained without material variation certain dates and arrived at definite conclusions/

clusions.

In 1915, however, hardly 18 months after effect had been given to the suggestions put forward by the Board after their full enquiry they recommended the inclusive of an additional (fourth) fishing area in the following terms :-

> "The Board recommends that instead of there
> "being three areas as at present defined in
> "Proclamation No. 50 of 1914, there should be
> "four x x x x x x x x x"

No reasons were assigned for the Board's recommendation upon this point.

By Proclamation No. 168 of the 13th October 1915 effect was given to this alteration which creates four districts progressively extending in area along the West Coast and fixes opening and closing dates for the respective seasons presenting a progressive gradation by periods of one month.

In the past the experience has been that applications were received for extensions of the fishing season owing to seasonal conditions etc. but this was not the case in 1914 and 1915. Quite recently, however, (on the 31st January 1916) the following representation was received from the Magistrate at Hopefield :-

> "Your notice catching of Crayfish Cape Times
> "27th. Owing to probable distress strong rea-
> "sons why Section three schedule should be
> "amended to ending on 15th February. Am ad-
> "vised fish healthy and no danger of catching
> "females in berry".

This referred to the new area No. 3 from Hatroos Point to Cape Columbine, and it will be observed that the reason for the change does not rest upon facts connected with the Industry but upon the argument of distress

Bearing in mind the recorded facts as shewn by Statement A, it would now seem that the period for the fishing season in the Southern most section (Area No. 1) might be approximately the same, and as that now recommended with No. 3 Area there seem to be grounds for the view that from Cape Point to the most northerly point on the Western Coast in respect of which any information is/

is available, Crayfish are in a condition suitable for canning purposes fro a date probably somewhere early in January.

The application from Hopefield (in respect to Area No. 3) was substantiated by certain trial nettings carried out.

The result being as follows according to the Fishery Officer's Report :-

"Crawfish caught Jacob's Bay and North West Bay "Area three, hard new shell females included".

"Proceeding in a North-easterly direction, I "fished on the grounds at "Jacob's Bay" and "North "West Bay" in Area No. 3, and found the Crawfish "to be in hard new shell, male and female fish a- "like. The females had no sign of berry on them, "and the Males were in excellent condition x x x" "The total captures of Crawfish made on this occa- "sion were as follows :-

Area No. 3.

"Jacob's Bay,	Males in hard new shell	7
	Females in hard new shell	1
"North West Bay,	Males in hard new shell	42
	Females in hard new shell	6
	Total	56

Average size of Males in Area 3 -- 5. 198 inches.

Similar nettings in Area No. 4 showed a different result, the Fishery Officer reporting as follows :-

"At Paternoster and Shell Bay, Area 4, males firm "new shell small undersized, females in eyed berry "predominate".

"On rounding Columbine Point, I commenced fishing "at "Back Bay" in Area No. 4, and proceeded to try "the Fishing Grounds at "Seal Island" Shell Bay", "and in the vicinity of "Brandhuis", but in this "area caught only small and undersized male fish "and a quantity of female fish in berry, most of "the berry being in an advanced state" x x x x x "The total captures of Crawfish made on this occa- "sion were as follows :-

Area No. 4.

"Back Bay,	Males in hard new shell	12
	Females in berry	28
"Seal Island,	Males in hard new shell	10
	Females in berry	6
	Females in hard old shell	5
"Shell Bay,	Males in hard new shell	nil
	Females in berry	8
	Females in hard old shell	2
	Total	71

Average size of Males in Area 4 -- 3. 681 inches.

The fact ~~of~~ that two such widely differing series conditions,

conditions should be found to exist with in a very limited distance is remarkable and brings up the point that the trial nettings were necessarily few (in each case), the area covered limited, and that naturally they give no substantial guidance as to the condition which may prevail within a distance of a few miles northward or southward of the area covered by the experimental hauls.

Upon the information quoted, however, the Board decided to recommend that fishing in Area No. 3 should be permitted subject to further investigations and these have been arranged for. The fishing period in No. 3 Area is therefore advanced by one month and automatically the close season corresponding reduced from 4 months to 3 months.

The factories situated in No. 4 Area may ask for similar considerations of their circumstances since the effect has been to advance the opening of the fishing season in Area No. 3. (Since this note was drafted this request has been made).

Investigations are therefore about to be carried out in No. 4 area and these results will in due course be presented to the Board.

Apart, however, from the mere fact of settling the difficulty of the moment for the present year by revising the date from which fishing in No. 4 Area shall commence the position on the wider aspect of the matter is that the established theories and accepted beliefs have been to a considerable extent brought under review -- not to say shaken -- and the latest arrangement of season has been abandoned in certain material points without having been put through one seasons trial.

Either therefore the question of the condition of fish over a considerable area of the Coast at given times should be considered '<u>de novo</u>' or the most recent arrangements respecting the Northern Areas 3 and 4 should be reviewed and the reasons for their adoption reconsidered.

Another/

Another view which has been presented is that there should be no fixity or continuity in determining the seasons in any particular section of the Coast in any year and that the fishing or close season should be fixed from time to time as the facts of the moment may be taken to indicate. It would be well for the Board carefully to consider this because obviously it would be an arrangement extremely difficult to carry into actual practice. It would be fruitful in the production of complaints and appeals for readjustments of whatever might be decided upon and it would be an unusual method to apply to such an operation as that in point. ~~I think~~ Such a principle is not applied to close season in respect to "game", such seasons being fixed for various areas on facts as to the general condition of game in such areas owing to climatic and other conditions.

Another view is that it may be found that the habits of Crayfish are such that it may be possible to define special areas in which fishing may be entirely prohibited, or prohibited for certain periods in order, for example, to provide sanctuaries for females; or again for males at various periods, such as periods of change of shell and the like.

The entire protection of the existing supplies of fish within certain defined areas, as an alternative or adjunct to proposals for establishment of hatcheries for artificial productions of additional supply seems ~~also~~ to be worthy of consideration.

It is not I think claimed that the conditions in the Cape Province in respect to the depletion of crayfish supply in any way as yet approximates to those which induced the introduction of lobster hatcheries in Canada : but it is desired to provide in good time against any such contingency.

This being so it would seem that conservation of what exists should certainly go hand in hand with artific production.

It/

It seems desirable therefore that an attempt should be made to ascertain whether benefit would be likely to result from entire prohibition of fishing in certain defined areas for certain periods. Whether such prohibition shall apply to isolated and selected areas or to a defined belt along the whole coast would no doubt call for investigation but light would probably be thrown upon it by the experience of practical fishermen.

Another point is the relative lengths of fishing and close seasons which appear to be somewhat disproportionate, namely, 8 months as against 4 -- this figure again being reduced (vide Statement A) owing to changes in dates in consequence of representations as to loss of fishing time to Factories and so forth. In the 4 months is also embraced a period during which the operations of nature render the fish unsuitable for use.

The question of the effect of close seasons upon operations of factories is of course a very important one but it is secondary to the primary object of the regulations which is preservation of the supply of crayfish as a public asset.

There is thus practically little or no period of "protection"--properly so called -- for vigorous fish in good condition and it may be worth considering whether some special steps should not be taken in this respect with regard to both sexes.

Lewis Marsh

S T A T E M E N T.

CRAWFISH FISHING SEASONS ON THE DIFFERENT AREAS SINCE THE YEAR 1906..

	Period of Open Season	Close Season From	Close Season To	Period of Close Season.	Limits of the Area	Proc. No.
	8	1st September	31st Dec.	4	In and around Hout Bay.	517
	8½	16th October	31st Jan.	3½	The West Coast South of a point 20 miles South of the entrance to Saldanha Bay.	
	8	1st August	30th November	4	The West Coast North to the Orange River	406
	8½	16th October	31st Jan.	3½	This applies to the above three areas.	"
	"	--do--	--do--	"	" " " " "	456
	"	--do--	--do--	"	" " " " "	
	8½	15th October	31st Jan.	3½	From Jacob's Rock Southward for the remainder of the Coast.	
	8½	15th October	31st Jan.	3½		102
	8½	15th December	31st March	3½	From Jacob's Rock Northward to the Orange River	
ice					The whole Coast South of Jacob's Rock	
--do--					" " " "	250
	8½	15th December	31st March	3½	From Jacob's Rock Northwards to the Orange River.	
	8½	15th October	31st Jan.	3½	From Jacob's Rock Southwards	
	"	--do--	--do--	"	" " "	51
					From Jacob's Rock Northward to the Orange River.	
	10	1st November	31st Dec.	2	Hout Bay Area defined specially in the Proclamation	
	8	1st November	28th Feb.	4	The remainder of the Coast South of Jacob's Rock, excluding Hout Bay	230
	8½	15th December	31st March	3½	Jacob's Rock Northward to the Orange River	
	10	1st November	31st Dec.	2	Duiker Point Southwards for the remainder of the Coast.	
	8	1st November	28th Feb.	4	Jacob's Rock Southwards to Duiker Point.	20
	8½	15th December	31st March	3½	Jacob's Rock Northward to the Orange River.	
	9	8th October	31st Dec.	3	From Cape Point to Duiker Point	
	8	1st November	28th Feb.	4	From Duiker Point to Jacob's Rock	250
	8½	15th December	31st March	3½	From Jacob's Rock to the Orange River.	
	8	15th September	15th Jan.	4	Cape Point to Duiker Point.	
	8	15th October	15th Feb.	4	Duiker Point to Cape Columbine	50
	8	15th November	15th March	4	Cape Columbine to the Orange River.	
	8	15th September	15th Jan.	4	Cape Point to Duiker Point	275
	8½	1st November	15th Feb.	3½	Duiker Point to Cape Columbine	--
	8½	1st December	15th March	3½	Cape Columbine to the Orange River	295
	8	15th September	15th Jan.	4	Cape Point to Duiker Point	168
	8	15th October	15th Feb.	4	Duiker Point to Matroos Point	"
	8	15th November	15th March	4	Matroos Point to Cape Columbine	"
	8	15th December	15th April	4	Cape Columbine to the Orange River	"

(Sgd) A. CRIPPS

8/3/16.

S T A T E M E N T.

SHOWING ALTERATIONS TO CRAWFISH FISHING SEASONS ON THE DIF

Year	Proclaimed Area No.	Fishing Season. From	Fishing Season. To	Period of Open Season	Close Season From	Close Season To
1906	1	1st January	31st August	8	1st September	31st Dec.
	2	1st February	15th October	8½	16th October	31st Jan.
	3	1st December	31st July	8	1st August	30th Novemb
1908	1	1st February	15th October	8½	16th October	31st Jan.
	2	--do--	--do--	"	--do--	--do--
	3	--do--	--do--	"	--do--	--do--
1910	1	1st February	14th October	8½	15th October	31st Jan.
	2	1st February	14th October	8½	15th October	31st Jan.
	3	1st April	14th December	8½	15th December	31st March
1911	1	1st February until further notice				
	2	--do--	--do-- --do--			
	3	1st April	14th December	8½	15th December	31st March
1912(a)	1	1st February	14th October	8½	15th October	31st Jan.
	2	--do--	--do--	"	--do--	--do--
	3	1st April until further notice				
1912(b)	1	1st January	31st October	10	1st November	31st Dec.
	2	1st March	31st October	8	1st November	28th Feb.
	3	1st April	14th December	8½	15th December	31st March
1913(a)	1	1st January	31st October	10	1st November	31st Dec.
	2	1st March	31st October	8	1st November	28th Feb.
	3	1st April	14th December	8½	15th December	31st March
1913(b)	1	1st January	7th October	9	8th October	31st Dec.
	2	1st March	31st October	8	1st November	28th Feb.
	3	1st April	14th December	8½	15th December	31st March
1914(a)	1	16th January	14th September	8	15th September	15th Jan.
	2	16th February	14th October	8	15th October	15th Feb.
	3	16th March	14th November	8	15th November	15th March
1914(b)	1	16th January	14th September	8	15th September	15th Jan.
	2	16th February	31st October	8½	1st November	15th Feb.
	3	16th March	30th November	8½	1st December	15th March
1915	1	16th January	14th September	8	15th September	15th Jan.
	2	16th February	14th October	8	15th October	15th Feb.
	3	16th March	14th November	8	15th November	15th March
	4	16th April	14th December	8	15th December	15th April

HG/P.

Office of the Fishery Advisory Board,

Cape Town, 28th February, 1914.

Protection of Crawfish.

Sir,

In response to your letter of the 20th September last, No. A 120 e, having regard to certain representations which the Board had made to you in the matter of the Crawfish Industry and the possible dangers of diminution or extermination to which it was exposed by reason of the absence of proper and adequate control of the methods in vogue in conducting and carrying on the Industry, and in view thereof requesting the Board to hold a public investigation into :-

(1) Iroposed close season.
(2) Size limit.
(3) Protection of females;

and further to advise on the sections of Coast Line applicable to a close season and varying as to the suitable dates for such section, I have the honour to submit the result of the Inquiry which was held on the 24th October, and 7th and 14th November last.

In all, seventeen persons connected with or employed in the Industry volunteered or were called upon to give evidence: eleven of these represented Canning Factories and six were Native and Italian Fishermen.

Development of Industry : Dr Gilchrist, Marine Biologist, has recently issued a most interesting and exhaustive report in connection with his investigations, which the Board recommends to the careful study of those interested in the Industry. Until 1874, crawfish were merely caught for a very limited local consumption and for bait. In that year the potentialities of the Crawfish as an Industry were realized and attempts were made to establish a Canning business. The projedt was attended with poor results and abandoned, and it was not until 1890 when a further attempt was made; but owing to difficulties and, it may be, a want of knowledge of the proper methods of preserving the fish the project again failed. From this time other attempts have been made with varying success but the Industry may claim to have been fairly established in 1902.

The rapid development and extension of the Industry very naturally gave occasion to the fear that the fishing was being overdone and that in course of time the supply might be exhausted, such as occurred to the Lobster Industry in America. As to whether this fear is justified is the real object of this Inquiry and the Board, as the result of its investigations and other sources has come to the/

Provincial Secretary,
CAPE TOWN.

the conclusion that there are grave reasons to fear that, unless precautions are taken to protect the Industry, there may be a great diminution in the supply.

The evidence taken was unanimous as to the urgent necessity for additional restrictions. The representatives of some of the existing Canneries were not prepared to admit that there was any diminution at present in the supply : on the contrary, it was said that at certain times of the year the supply was inexhaustible, but it was admitted by some of the witnesses that it was necessary to go further afield for the catch, and all were of opinion that with the present increase in the number of boats and men employed, a diminution in the supply might be anticipated. It was also stated that a diminution in the size had been observed in Table Bay and that the fish were scarcer at St. Helena Bay.

The native fishermen, on the other hand, state emphatically that there is a very marked falling off in the supply, and gave instances where crawfish were once abundant and are not now to be found.

As an instance of the possible drain on the supply it was stated in evidence that each Factory would absorb, when fully working, at least 1,000,000 fish per annum, and it is anticipated that in a few months' time there will be twelve Factories at work, which means a total output by Factories alone of twelve millions Crawfish every year. This quantity in itself is not alarming as the supply is enormous, but in view of further extension the Board considers that precautions are absolutely necessary to protect the Industry.

Close Season: The close season at present in vogue corresponds with the time during which the fish migrate to deeper water and cast their shell and are therefore not obtainable: this time seems to differ in various sections of the Coast, and consequently there should not be a uniform time for the close season. An opinion was expressed by some of the witnesses that there should be an additional close season between the 15th May and 15th June as the fish caught at that time are mostly female and small fish, but, pending further information, the Board is not prepared to make any recommendation on this point.

The Board is of opinion that whilst the close season may not afford sufficient protection, it should be retained, and that four months' close season recommended on a previous occasion be adhered to. The following is proposed :-

Cape Point to Duiker Point: September 15th to January 15th.

Duiker Point to Cape Columbine: October 15th to February 15th.

Cape Columbine to Orange River: November 15th to March 15th.

These are the seasons based on the evidence given by the Canning Companies; but it will be observed that the alleged differences in season is not quite in accordance with geographical position, and the Board would urge that steps be taken to procure more definite and independent information with regard to the spawning and moulting season of the crawfish at the different localities.

Size Limit:/

Size Limit: The opinion is unanimous that the present size limit (three inches from base of eyestalk to end of carapace) is too small. The following sizes have been proposed :- 3½, 4, 4½. The Board recommends that the size limit should be at least 4 inches, measured from the rostrum, or middle anterior spine, to the end of the carapace. This would represent about 3 and 5/9ths inches according to the old measurement.

Protection of female in berry: The Board is of opinion that no females in berry should be allowed to be taken.

Supervision: The Board is of opinion that, in view of the important dimensions which the Industry has already assumed and the development already in sight, the Government should exercise a strict supervision as to the manner in which the business is conducted, more especially in regard to sanitation and the quality of the fish at time of canning. There is evidence that the Industry has already suffered from defective canning, and the success of the Industry on a whole might be seriously affected by one or two bad shipments, and the Board recommends that the Factories should be licensed, and that investigations should be made with the object of ensuring the canning of sound products only.

Alleged variations in seasons, etc: The Board would also direct attention to the necessity of carrying out further investigations into such questions as the alleged variations of seasons at different localities on the coast, the migration of crawfish from one part to another, and the feasibility of artificial hatching. Much more information is required on these points in order to safeguard the industry, and the accompanying recommendations of the Board are in a measure tentative. The operations of the present and future factories should be carefully noted.

Catching of Crawfish for bait: The question of allowing crawfish to be caught for bait has engaged the serious attention of the Board. It would appear that the Table Bay fishermen would suffer severely if forbidden to capture crawfish for this purpose, and that at certain seasons they can get nothing but female crawfish. The Board is satisfied that the close season should not apply to crawfish caught for bait. If the fact be established that only berried females are procurable for the bait at certain times, as alleged by fishermen, due consideration should be given to this, stringent precautions being taken that any such priviliges are not abused.

Finally, there appears to be an urgent necessity for the enforcement of regulations, as they seem to have been hitherto more or less a dead letter.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your obedient Servant,

(Sgd) J. Wm. MUNNIK.

Secretary to Fishery Advisory Board

Memo from Cape Town Chamber of Commerce

THE CRAYFISH INDUSTRY.

It is very desirable that the laws of the Cape in regard to this industry should be framed to correspond, as far as possible, having regard to local circumstances, with those obtaining in other countries. If such legislation is introduced the fishing industry in general, and the Crayfish industry in particular, would probably now be in a flourishing condition. In reading through the Acts of other Countries it is obvious that while they encourage the protection of crayfish, the absence of legislation here encourages the extermination. As a result there appears to be an extraordinary decrease in supplies of large fish. Most of this information is obtained from the fishermen themselves.

They are of opinion generally that the crayfish industry in Table Bay will not last at the outside for more than three years, and it is therefore suggested that legislation should be introduced:

1. To protect immature fish.
2. To establish hatcheries for crayfish.
3. To establish spawning areas, and

any other particulars which can be adapted from other countries as a result of their experiences.

CRAYFISH INDUSTRY GENERALLY.

Unfortunately, in spite of the industry being on a progressive footing for the last ten years, the habits of the fish are practically as little known as when the industry first started.

We have valuable information given by Dr.Gilchrist on the scientific side, but, unfortunately, the bulk of these experiments have been carried out at the Aquarium at

Muizenberg/

Muizenberg in water that is almost foreign to the natural habits of crayfish. That unnatural state of Aquarium water is further aggravated by the fact that an adequate supply of water uncontaminated by chemical or bacterial impurities is necessary for the proper amount of oxygen required, if pumped by force through closed pipes and stored in tanks, such as the Aquarium, it does not give the subtle unknown requisites of healthy sea water. It is extremely difficult therefore to say whether these records are to be relied upon for future guidance.

Saldanha Bay, at one time, supplied the whole of the requirements for the factors situated there. To-day it is common knowledge that in spite of the natural facilities afforded in this Harbour scarcely a crayfish is to be found.

THE FISHING INDUSTRY GENERALLY.

There is very little official information to be obtained in regard to the industry as a whole. There is no doubt, however, that immature fish of almost every species are being landed in thousands on our coasts, constituting the bulk of our daily supplies.

If it be found necessary to promulgate laws prohibiting the catching of immature fish, this will seriously affect the coloured fishermen on our Coast, as the Writer has no hesitation in saying that three-quarters of the money earned to-day by the Fishermen is earned by catching immature fish.

Fishing may be classified under four headings, namely:-

(1) Deep/

(1) Deep Sea Line Fishermen, who proceed to German West for the purpose of catching snoek in bulk in large boats.

(2) The inshore Line Fishermen, who are almost entirely dependent on catching immature fish.

(3) The Trek Net or Seine Fishermen, who wait on the shores of various bays, until shoals of fish come into shallow water. These fishermen are the biggest offenders in killing millions of immature fish.

(4) and the Set Net Fishermen who should be confined to certain areas.

Further, there are trawlers, who are also responsible for killing millions of young fry, owing to there being no regulations as to what distance they should fish from the shore as there are in other countries, which is usually a three mile limit.

Bearing in mind the clashing of interests in the above methods of fishing, it is almost an unsurmountable difficulty to meet the wishes of all those concerned in the catching of fish. But unless some strong action is taken in the matter, the Writer considers that the day is not far distant, when the Inshore Line Fishermen will either be forced to adopt larger boats, or give up fishing, as the supply of immature fish cannot possibly last.

SNOEK.

Recently a circular was sent to the various Magistrates asking for information as to the habits of Snoek from Walfisch Bay to Mossel Bay. These records are most valuable in this respect as they conclusively prove the regularity as regards dates when snoek make their appearanc

The following is the position:-

It is reported at Walfisch Bay that Snoek begin to get in good condition from about the 15th. January.

Another point, a very important one from this centre, is that very rarely are small snoek, under the present legal size limit, that is under 24" ever caught. From Lambert's Bay to Hermanus the reports are entirely unanimous as to the prime condition of the snoek during the month of June. There might be a little fluctuation subject to weather conditions.

Ons/

DGL

One fact is clearly brought out from this evidence, and that is that the snoek spawn in the Cape Waters during June or July.

The following facts might be of interest:-

That the Writer has personally caught snoek fry in harder nets off the old Houille Point Lighthouse in the month of August to December, and that numerous quantities of small snoek are also caught by the Trek Net Fishermen from August on to December.

A further point is that Snoek are known to feed on one another, and instances can be brought to prove this. The conclusion, therefore, drawn is that the snoek which stay in Southern waters are snoek that have grown up in these waters, and that they remain there in self protection, not daring to mix with the larger fish in the Northern Areas, until such a time as they are able to defend themselves.

In Dr. Gilchrist's reports snoek of 24" are said to be immature fish, it is therefore, a very grave question whether the size limit should not be increased, but in spite of the latter being 24", the Writer has no hesitation in saying that over 300 (three hundred) tons of snoek of 22" and 23" were caught and killed last year. Snoek of this size average from 1,000 to 1,500 per ton. Snoek sold as fresh or slightly salted are not included in the above 300 tons.

If the Writer's observations could be proved, then the snoek in the Cape waters should be prohibited from being caught while in an immature state. If a law was promulgated prohibiting the catching of fish under 26" to 28" or whatever Dr.Gilchrist considers immature fish, it would mean that all the fishermen at Hermanus, and practically the bulk of the fishermen at Kalk Bay would be seriously affected, until the local shoals attained a mature size. On the other hand, should nothing be done, there is the grave danger that total extermination will take place. It is further recommended

that/

that snoek should not be caught from July to December, as before mentioned all mature fish have spawned in these waters and as a result are in a very poor condition, and in the Writer's opinion, not fit for consumption.

From the commercial side it is entirely due to the capture of poor snoek that the market of Mauritius has developed into one of a gamble rather than one of stability.

RIVERS AND INLETS.

Twenty years ago enormous quantities of Geelbeck alias Cape Salmon were caught in the Berg River.

About ten years ago, the Writer had boats sent to Olifhant's River, and found that the Geelbeck had migrated to there in fairly large quantities.

Unfortunately netting of every description has been encouraged in these rivers, and in all our inlets on the Coast, and the scarcity of Geelbeck the Writer attributes chiefly to the above fact. This also applies to the Lagoon Saldanha Bay.

Strong measures should be taken to totally prohibit netting of any description in places where fish are known to come when in spawn.

Official information may be got with reference to the above in regard to the Zwartkop River, where investigations have been taking place on this question for some considerable time.

Minutes of Meeting of Fishery Advisory Board held on Friday, the 12th May, 1916.

Present: Mr.Mansergh (Chairman), Dr.Gilchrist, and Messrs. A.H.Reid, Stephan, Irvin and Mr.Cripps (Fishery Officer).

The Minutes of the previous meeting were confirmed.

Mr.A.H.Reid stated that Mr.Wynne regretted very much that he was unable to be present owing to the necessity of his leaving Town with some of the other Members of the Provincial Council.

(1) The Table Bay Fishing Harbour:

A plan of the Harbour was laid on the table for the information of Members.

The Chairman introduced Col. Nicholson, Resident Engineer, S.A.Railways & Harbours, to whom he explained that representations had been made to the Board that there were serious objections to the use, by the local fishermen, when completed, of the Fishing Harbour now under construction. He then asked Members acquainted with these representations to lay them before Col. Nicholson.

Mr. Stephan said that according to Messrs. Lewis and J.G.Rose, and others, the chief objections are:-

(1) Insufficient area for the accommodation of the boats. There ~~were~~ are 135 boats and for these only a portion of the Harbour, as at present constructed, ~~was~~ is available.

(2)The South East winds bring a strong current into the Harbour.

(3) The entrance to the Harbour is too narrow with the result that there is a continual eddy.

(4) That it ~~was~~ is physically impossible for fishermen in open boats to make the entrance in bad weather.

(5) The need of more shelter for boats.

In the course of the discussion that followed the subjoined information and views of Col. Nicholson on the subject were gleaned:-

That

That the Fishing Community had an interview with the Cape Town Council, at which was present Captain Price, who practically proved to the fishermen the safety of the Harbour.

After this meeting the Council decided to take over the Harbour. Its construction had so far cost £14,000, which amount will now have to be met by the Council who had arranged for a further expenditure of £32,000. It was generally admitted that the Harbour is not an ideal one but it had been decided that the fishermen must leave Rogge Bay and the site selected is the best available. Woodstock is impossible.

It is essential when constructing a Harbour to take into cognisance the requirements of the future. A few years hence there will probably be no open boats. At Kalk Bay five open boats have already been raised and converted into motor boats.

The width of the Docks entrance by sea is 350 feet whereas that of the entrance to the proposed Fishing Harbour is 250 feet.

In his opinion there would be more difficulty in getting out to sea than in getting in to the Harbour. The Italian fishermen are already using the Harbour and are delighted with it. They are prepared to prove that the entrance can be made in open boats except when a howling South Easter is blowing, but then, under such conditions, the boats even now do not venture out.

He did not consider that there would be a greater run of water in the Harbour than in the Docks where it is 18 inches

The complaint as to the inadequate accommodation was not well founded as arrangements existed for the beaching of at least 60 boats. The landing has a gradual slope and is concreted at the water edge.

Additional shelter could be obtained by extending the one arm of the Harbour eastwards. This would greatly improve the shelter inside. The Council had already made enquiries in this direction and the work will probably be undertaken by the Railway Administration, who was willing to help in every possible way.

The gates at the Docks are to be moved further back so that the land entrance to the Harbour will be open. Some alterations to the train lines will also be made. This will obviate the necessity of shunting operations which now take place,opposite the entrance to the Harbour. When this has been effected the only trouble will be the passing of through trains.

Mr.Irvin proposed a vote of thanks to Col. Nicholson for his attendance and the explanations he had so kindly given; and moved that no action be taken by the Board until the receipt of the representations of the Cape Fishermen, which, it is understood, are in preparation.

Mr. A. H. Reid seconded.

Carried.

(2) Zwartkops River netting.

Dr. Gilchrist submitted the following report on the matter:-

"Monthly nettings have been regularly carried out since July last.

Among the most important results are the following:-

No fish with mature eggs have been found in the river.

The larger majority of fish have not reached the spawning stage.

The only fish which seems to go up the river to the upper reaches for spawning seem to be the barbel.

Evidence seems to indicate that the fish remain mostly in the river and do not pass out and in with the tide as asserted.

No large sharks were caught in the nettings. Some skate caught did not ~~xxxx~~ prove to be "fish eaters".

Though no spawning fish were found in the nettings that spawning does take place in theriver was shown by tow-nettings in which many eggs were found. There were floating eggs.

No very small fish found in nettings."

(3) Berg River Fishing.

Mr. Stephan stated that the local people are preparing a strong petition against all netting and fishing of any kind in the Berg River.

J. W. Munnik

Secretary.

CONFIRMED.

Louis Mansergh

Chairman.

14. 7. 16.

Minutes of Meeting of Fishery Advisory Board held on Friday, the 14th July, 1916.

Present: Messrs. Mansergh (Chairman) and Runciman. Mr.Cripps (Fishery Officer).

Letters expressing regret at being unable to be present were received from Messrs. Van Zyl and A.H.Reid, the latter gentleman having to attend a meeting of the Valuation Court.

(1). Mr.Mansergh's Notes on memorandum from Cape Town Chamber of Commerce in respect to certain matters relative to fishing industry.

As the Members of the Board are now in possession of Mr.Mansergh's notes which deal exhaustively with the points raised by the Chamber of Commerce, it was decided to invite the Chamber to meet the Board with a view to a discussion of the points at issue.

(2). Capture of Undersized Crawfish.

Mr.Mansergh mentioned that since the discussion with the Deputation of Canners, who had asked for more judicious enforcement of the regulations in regard to Crawfish, he had seen the Chief of Police and that there had been no further reports of undersized Crawfish being landed from boats.

(3). Dead Trout found at Stellenbosch: Analysis of water.

In connection with the Analyst's report which showed considerable pollution of water but indicated the need of getting an idea of the normal composition of the water above the distillery before it could be possible to determine whether such contamination resulted from an effluent from the distillery, Mr.Mansergh stated that it is proposed to postpone the matter until next year when samples could be taken under conditions similar to that found by Mr.Reid.

(4) Netting in Berg River.

By means of a map Mr.Mansergh indicated the positions of Flamink Vlei, Velddrift Flat, Zwaartjes Baai ("De Plaat") Schuitjes Drift, and Kerschbosch Drift, being ~~xx~~ portions of the Berg River or Vleis ~~remitting~~ resulting from overflow of water from the Berg River where, it had been suggested, set netting should be allowed.

As

As only Flamink Vlei, Velddrift Flat, and Zwaartjes Baai, are breakaways (or "platen") from the main current of the Berg River, it was proposed to issue a proclamation limiting fishing by means of set or stake nets in the Berg river to these three places for a period of three years from the date of proclamation.

The issue of the Proclamation was approved.

(5) Netting in Zwartkops River.

The recommendations of Dr.Gilchrist were considered but as it is understood that representations from the netters and anglers will probably be received soon and as the present proclamation does not expire until the 12th September, 1916, it was decided to postpone making any definite recommendation at the moment.

The Secretary was also instructed to communicate again with Mr.Wynne in order to obtain his views on the subject.

(6). Mr.Reid's letters re permit for catching Trout during close season and alteration of present close season.

As the Executive Committee had already decided adversely in the matter of granting permits it was decided not to make any recommendation at the moment and to collect further data bearing on the need of altering the present close season for Trout.

(7). Crawfish: Fishery Officer's recent visit of inspection.

At the request of Mr.Mansergh, Mr.Cripps stated that the first haul of crawfish made by him was at

(1) Back Bay about 150 yards from the Paternoster Fisheries where females were caught and tow nettings taken in that area showed innumerable immature crawfish. From there he went to Tamarind Rock about 500 yards further north where a large number of male and female fish in hard shell were caught. From there to Shell Bay the fish caught were in hard shell and healthy condition but were mostly of small size.

In reply to an enquiry from Mr.Mansergh, Mr.Cripps stated

that

that the area south of Duiker Point could not be improved upon and that the season should remain as it is. So far as information was available area 2 should be up to Columbine Point but that it is essential for experimental investigations to be conducted between Matroos Point and North West Bay so as to get exact data as to the condition of fish at different times of the year (especially around Dassen Island).

(8) Appointment of Officers in connection with Fishery matters

Mr.Mansergh stated that Dr.Gilchrist had secured the services of a man to make experimental hauls by tow netting etc., and that at twelve or thirteen stations along the coast men had been appointed for the purpose of obtaining a regular flow of information on fishing matters, such as statistics, etc.

(9) Increase in price of Fish.

In connection with a report in the "Cape Times" that the price of fish in Johannesburg had been raised 1d per lb., Mr.Mansergh promised to make enquiries as to the reason for this increase, and especially to write to the Johannesburg Municipality in the matter, and also to ascertain whether the Cape Town Market has been affected.

J. W. Munnik.
Hon. Secretary.

Confirmed.

Lewis Mansergh
Chairman.
22. 7. 16

Minutes of Meeting of Fishery Advisory Board at the Huguenot Buildings, on Friday, the 22nd September, 1916.

Present: Mr.Mansergh (Chairman), Dr.Gilchrist, and Messrs. A.H.Reid, J.G.Reid, Irvine, and Stephan.

The Minutes of previous Meeting were confirmed.

(1) Crawfish: Close Seasons.

Mr.Stephan claimed that the present close seasons ~~is~~ are no protection to crawfish, and that the proper system would be to proclaim places or areas as "closed" according to when the fish became sick.

Mr.Mansergh pointed out the difficulties which would face his Department if such a proposal were accepted.- Would Canners not object having to close, under such circumstances, at short notice? Then there is the difficulty of controlling the 300 miles of coast to ascertain when the fish are becoming sick.

Mr.J.G.Reid stated that all fishermen, whom he had consulted, were not in favour of the extension of the season at the moment but that they were all unanimous that in the middle of January the fish were in good condition.

Mr.Stephan considered the outlook for the future as gloomy and viewed as essential the creation of protected spawning grounds.

The following close seasons were eventually agreed upon:-

Area No.1: Cape Point to Duiker Point.

1st October to 31st January.

Area No.2: Duiker Point to Columbine Point.

1st November to 28th February.

Area No.3: Columbine Point to Baboon Point, Elands Bay.

1st December to 31st March.

Investigations are to be made into the condition of fish North of Elands Bay so as to procure date on which to base a close season for that area.

(2) Trout

(2) Trout Fishing Season in Western Area of Cape Province:

Mr.Mansergh stated that in accordance with the recommendations of the Board, the Western Districts Game and Trout Protection Association circularised various members of Angling Clubs affiliated to the Association, and, after consideration of the views received, recommended the following open seasons:-

(a) From 1st October in one year to 31st January in the following year for Eerste River.

(b) From 1st October in one year to 30th April in the following year for all other rivers.

Subject to the modification against the Eerste River (recommendation (a)) being applied to the Lourens River as well the recommendations were agreed to.

(3) Net Fishing in the Little Brak River, Mossel Bay.

Mr.A.H.Reid, stated in connection with the recommendation of the Mossel Bay Angling and Acclimatizing Association for the prohibition of netting in the Little Brak River from its junction with Klein Doorn River to the Sea, that millions of young soles and other young fish were destroyed by netting by farmers, who camped during their holidays along the river side.

The recommendation was endorsed by the Board.

(4) Zwartkops River Netting.

Mr.Mansergh stated that as the Proclamation of last year, extending the existing regulations for one year, expired at the end of August and as the scientific investigations recommended by the Board were not completed and feeling between Anglers and Netters were running high in the district, it was thought desirable to leave the matter in statu quo, and a Proclamation was therefore issued prohibiting netting for another year.

(5) Netting

(5) Netting for Fish off Robben Island.

The Board decided not to recommend the application of the Commissioner, Robben Island, for the deletion from Proclamation No.264 of 1911 of the following words:-

> "other than such net as is usually employed for the purpose of catching crayfish, and generally known as a Kreeft Net"

as it would be most undesirable to prohibit fishermen from obtaining crawfish in the area referred to in the said Proclamation.

Correspondence on the following subjects were passed:

(6) Proposed fertiliser factory at Woodstock Beach; report of the Assistant Medical Officer of Health for the Union.

(7) Capture of Female Crawfish in Berry: Fishery Officer's report.

(8) Experiment Crawfish Fishing in Areas 3 and 4 off Malmesbury Coast.

(9) Sea water from St.Helena Bay: report of Dr.Gilchrist.

(10) Increased price of Fish at Johannesburg.

(11) Suggested introduction of Herring Ova into South Africa.

J. W. Munnik.

SECRETARY.

Confirmed.

Lewis Marsh

CHAIRMAN.

8/5/1917

Minutes of Meeting of the Fishery Advisory Board held at Huguenot Buildings on Tuesday, 8th May, 1917.

Present: Mr. Mansergh (Chairman), Dr. Gilchrist, and Messrs. Runciman, J.G.Reid, A.H.Reid, Van Zyl, and Stephan. Also Mr. Cripps (Fishery Officer).

The Minutes of the previous Meeting were read and confirmed.

Mr. A.H.Reid asked for the loan, from the Secretary, of the correspondence on Trout. This was agreed to.

Close Season for Crawfish in No.2 Area from May 15th - June 15th, 1917: Application from Cape Town Crayfish Canning Companies.

Dr. Gilchrist agreed that about June female crawfish were soft and in berry. Canners appeared to forget that they were thus already protected by law.

Mr. J.G.Reid pointed out that protection was desired to prevent the crawfish being disturbed during this period.

In reply to Mr. Stephan, Dr. Gilchrist stated that the males fertilised the females after the casting of the shell.

Mr. Stephan remarked that the creation of areas did not prevent canners going from one area to fish in another which was open. What was wanted were sanctuaries closed for all time. The fish would soon discover them.

Mr. J.G.Reid stated that during May and June the fish are small and mostly females and these were in berry. Apart from Dr. Gilchrist the only available source of information as to whereabouts of crawfish were the Italians, who were all in favour of a Close Season though they may be influenced by the Snoek Season, which is during the same period. Italians knew where to get the females and also the male fish in the deeper waters. The disturbance through fishing being allowable during this period must do damage. He instanced one haul in which 25 fish were caught, out of which not three were in condition: the rest had to be thrown back into the sea. Recently in the Docks, out of 78 rejected fish 68 were females in berry. He favoured close season during which Fishery Officer should make daily investigations under actual conditions under which the fish are caught: the canners would be prepared to provide boat and point out where hauls are made.

Dr. Gilchrist explained the origin of the present Close Seasons, which were fixed on representations from fishing community and coincided with the period when fish were sick and were naturally protected. He was prepared to advise the shifting of the Close Season to winter for four continuous months. It was of immense advantage to protect areas where the fish spawn.

In reply to observations by Mr. Runciman, Mr. Mansergh intimated that the Fishery Estimates had been increased by £500 this year and that the cost of two additional Inspectors, with travelling allowance, to inspect canneries, as suggested by Mr. Runciman, would come to about £600 per annum.

Dr. Gilchrist and Mr. Cripps submitted tables showing kind and condition of crawfish caught in No.2 Area during different months of the year. On the suggestion of Mr. van Zyl, it was decided to have copies thereof made and circulated among Members.

Mr. Cripps gave the following particulars of crawfish caught by the Canneries during the years 1915 and 1916:-

1915

	1915.	1916.
Caught	14,094,464	12,327,640
Females	4,128,714	2,330,252
Males	9,965,750	9,997,388

Mr. Stephan pointed out that these figures were by no means a true indication as to the number of males and females caught, as it was utterly impossible, under the conditions under which the fish are counted, to state positively whether they are a male or female, a view shared by other Members of the Board.

(1) Mr. Van Zyl moved: That the request of the representatives of the Cape Town Crayfish Canning Companies at their interview with the Provincial Secretary on the 26th ultimo, for a close season for Crawfish from the 15th May to the 15th June be acceded to; and that, in addition, Dr. Gilchrist should proceed immediately with the mapping out, in the present Areas, of sanctuaries for perpetual closing.

(2) Mr. J.G.Reid moved: That during the above close season (i.e. 15th May - 15th June) the Fishery Officer should make experimental hauls of crawfish for the purpose of ascertaining their condition, etc.

(3) Mr. Runciman moved: That during the open seasons the Fishery Officer should inspect, at least once a week, each crawfish factory for the purpose of ascertaining the condition, size, sex, etc., of the crawfish caught.

The above resolutions were all unanimously carried.
Mr. Stephan brought up the question of Netting in Rivers, and Mr. Mansergh suggested that Mr. Stephan should submit a report thereon when a Meeting could possibly be held in a fortnight's time to discuss the matter. This was agreed to.

J. W. Munnik.

SECRETARY.

Confirmed.

L. Runciman 28.5.17.

CHAIRMAN.

Minutes of Meeting of the Fishery Advisory Board, held on Tuesday, the 29th May, 1917, at Huguenot Buildings.

Present: Mr. Mansergh (Chairman), Dr. Gilchrist and Messrs. Stephan, Van Zyl, Irvin, J.G. and A.H.Reid. Also Mr. Cripps, Fishery Officer.

Minutes of previous Meeting were read and confirmed.

Proposed Prohibition of Netting in Rivers and River Estuaries:

The following report was submitted by Mr. Stephan:-

"In submitting my views on the question of destruction of Sea Fish in our rivers and estuaries, and the necessity of protecting these rivers from netting, I am at once faced with the fact that there is sufficient data as to the practical knowledge in regard to the habits of the various species. The subject of sanctuaries is one of live importance and one requiring thorough experimentation. It is not the method of laboratory experiment that is needed so much as that of field experiment, and continual observation of the movements of fishes, and their utilization of sanctuaries. It is unfortunate that more practical experience has not been gained by a strict enforcement of the provision requiring sanctuaries, and subsequent precise observation of their efficient working. In this way, would the best of experience be gained. We are still to-day deficient in our knowledge of the movements of fishes, what fishes migrate, and exactly at what season does the migration occur with the various species, and what is the extent of the movement with the several species. For lack of this knowledge, we find ourselves in exactly the same position as we were in 1883, when Mr. Holland introduced a private Bill into the House of Assembly in regard to the Swartkops River on this very question now before us. This measure became Law in the same year as Act No.7 of 1883, and provided for a close season against netting fish. How far this act has been carried out, I am unable to state.

Gentlemen, I need hardly remind you that our fish are amongst the finest, and our fisheries the most varied, in the world. They are not situated like the fisheries of a single country. We have opportunities of developing our fisheries over a vast area, well-nigh as vast as Europe. On account of the fact that we are surrounded by two oceans: But in comparison with other countries, what has been done? Let me quote some official figures. For Canada, in the year 1908, the official reports in the Blue Book give the value of fish as $25,000,000, approximately £5,254,203 to $27,000,000, approximately £5,655,462. 12,000 Canadian vessels are employed, having a value of $62,620,000, approximately £13,155,462 - also 46,000 small boats are employed, having a value of $1,200,000, approximately £252,100. Nets, Gear, etc., are valued at $3,000,000, approximately £630,252., and the total number of men engaged is 84,000. The finest material in the Canadian Navy have come from these people, and we know to-day that in Europe the fishermen have by no means played a small part in this War.

In 1914-15, the total value of fish was $31,264,631, approximately £6,568,199.- invested in fishing along the coast - $22,331,072, approximately £4,670,603., and the number of people employed was 94,513.

The expenditure in connection with the fisheries of Canada, amounted to $1,305,776, approximately £274,320., divided amongst the various services as follows:-

Salaries

Salaries & Disbursements of Fisheries Officers -	$275,950,	approx.	£57,876
Fish Breeding -	$370,093,	"	£77,750
Miscellaneous Expenditure -	$659,732,	"	£131,946

In addition to which the sum of $159,584, " £31,916, was distributed as fishing bounty. The total revenue from fishing licenses, fines, etc., in the different provinces was $101,635, approx: £21,356. The total number of fry distributed from various hatcheries reached the enormous figure of 1,643,725,212. The export value of fish was $19,687,086, approximately £4,135,942.

Before dealing with my personal observations, I submit that the Board as an Advisory Board, is seriously handicapped without the practical knowledge as stated in the first part of this report, and further, that we are doing a serious injury to our manhood in allowing, as stated by Dr. Gilchrist's Marine Biological Report No.2., a thousand people to be dependent on the Berg River alone. Of the 27 boats there, only a few go to sea. I submit that if sanctuaries are created, and properly looked after, the best of experience would be gained, which, in itself would warrant their adoption.

REPORT.

An inspection of the Swatkops River was made by the Government Biologist in 1904, and the conclusions arrived at was, that the only fish in danger was a variety of Barbel. It is stated in Dr. Gilchrist's Report on the same river last year, that the majority of spawn found was that of miniature soles, not suitable for commercial purposes. On looking up his report on the Berg River, I find that here again, the spawn of the Bagger predominates - also a fish of very little use for commercial purposes. I do not, for a moment, doubt the accuracy of these reports issued, but I am of opinion that the experimental trials were not made at the time of the year when such fish as Haarders, White Stompneus, Steenbras, Kapeljauw, and Cape Salmon frequent the Rivers and Estuaries in quantities, certainly they are not in spawn during the month of January, when the experimental trial took place in the Berg River. On page 81. in the Marine Biological Report No.2., line 10., you will note that "sea fish are fairly plentiful in the Berg River", that is, during January. The records kept by Carl Stephan at Berg River Mouth, have, unfortunately, been destroyed, I am, therefore, unable to give the time of the year when boat-loads of Haarders, Cape Salmon and Kapeljauw were freely trekked. On page 83. of the No.2. Report conclusive proof is given that Bokkoms frequent the River. The inference drawn from that report is that Bokkoms of 7 or 9 inches in length are immature Haarders, therefore they cannot spawn. Let me assure Dr. Gilchrist that Bokkoms of less than 5 inches are capable of being in full roe, and thousands of these can be caught between November and February in full roe amongst the rocks at Mouille Point. I think I am correst in saying that the chief spawning season for Bokkoms and Haarders is during December. I have caught Bokkoms and Haarders in full roe in the same month. The fact that 4,000 large Haarders were caught from the seashore at Berg River (see page 83, No.2 Report) consisting mainly of spent females does not necessarily prove that they had not spawned in the River. Taking the habits of Bokkoms and Haarders into consideration, I cannot understand how it was that no eggs or spent females were seen in the River. The habits of these interesting specie, when approaching inlets during fine weather, for the purpose of

feeding

feeding, render them most difficult to catch; for this reason, between the adult Haarders and the shore there is a protecting screen of Bokkoms, varying sometimes from 1" upwards, in perfect order as regards various sizes. The moment there is any apparent danger, such as the splash of an oar or any disturbing noises, the small fry in-shore immediately warn, through the protecting screen, the larger ones. Unless, therefore, a trek-net or seine can surround the whole shoal, which it is almost an impossibility to do, before the danger signal is given, the larger fish escape. It is for this reason only the figures quoted in the Report No.2., as given by Stephan Bros., show a far larger percentage of Bokkoms caught than Haarders. In consistence, therefore, with the habits of the Haarders and Bokkoms, it must be assumed that if Bokkoms were caught five miles up the river, Haarders must also come into the river there. There is another period when the larger Haarder visits sandy beaches, e.g., before a storm. Curiously enough, they do not adopt the protecting screen on these occasions, but come to the shore for one object only - to pick up ballast - they actually fill themselves up with sand in order to sink more readily in deep water, which enables them to weather the storm with greater ease. It is on these occasions that big hauls are made by the fishermen. Whenever Haarders are caught with sand in their bellies, it is a sure sign of bad weather coming. On the first occasion upon noticing this, I was told it meant bad weather - I laughed at the idea, but my unbelief cost me my nets. The next day a severe storm sprang up, and I never saw my nets again.

Extract on Page 25. from "Sea fisheries of the Cape Colony", by W.Wardlaw Thompson, F.Z.S., is worth quoting "Little or nothing is known, however, of the breeding habits or life history of such fish as the Cape Salmon, and other valuable species, which frequent the Swatkops Estuary at various seasons". I have no doubt that what has happened at the Berg River, Oliphants River, and Langebaan Lagoon, has also happened at the above named River, namely, that through these inlets becoming death traps by overnetting, Cape Salmon have almost entirely disappeared from our Coast. I say this with all confidence, because Cape Salmon were caught in large quantities prior to 1900, both at Langebaan and at Berg River. In 1907, Cape Salmon had almost ceased to exist in the Berg River and Langebaan Lagoon, in consequence of which, I sent two boats to the Oliphants River, and found these fish fairly plentiful. Unfortunately, this river has since been completely netted out. If, therefore, it can be proved to-day that any river further north of the Oliphants River which is not already netted out, contains large quantities of Cape Salmon, I maintain that this would be conclusive proof, even if they do not spawn in the river, that they require these inlets as sanctuaries. Next to Cape Salmon, the Kapeljauw has also almost entirely disappeared. On page 81 of the Marine Biological Report No.2. it is stated the Kapeljauw were formerly abundant in the Berg River and the eggs of these fish were actually found there by Dr. Gilchrist. This, to my mind, is a very important and significant fact for more often than not, Kapeljauw and Cape Salmon trek together, and it would have been an unusual thing if either linesmen or netters did not catch them at one and the same time. I believe, also, that the habits of these two species are remarkably similar.

In concluding my report, I recommend the total prohibition of all netting in our rivers and estuaries, and I sincerely hope the Board will realize this is a matter of extreme benefit to our Country, if worked on proper lines, and I venture to hope

they will give the matter their serious consideration. I fully realise the obligation members of the Board are placed in with regard to the fishermen at present earning their livelihood from the Rivers, but maintain that as far as Berg River is concerned these fishermen can easily earn a far better living by fishing for the crayfish Factories, and for the Snoek trade, during the seasons. Not only would this be more beneficial for them, but the morale and physique of the men would vastly improve, and they would have an opportunity of turning from wasters into good citizens."

Mr. Stephan said that he submitted his report not with the idea of criticism but for discussion of an important subject. He felt strongly that experiments should be made in the creation of sanctuaries for fish. Over-netting in rivers was responsible for extraordinary fluctuations in catches of fish to-day.

Mr. Mansergh admitted that the Zwartkops River Fish Protection Act of 1883, though repealed by the Fisheries Ordinance of 1911, formed a precedent for closing of rivers.

Dr. Gilchrist, commenting on report, stated that in the United States there were many laboratory stations, though, of course, the work of such stations should go hand in hand with practical local investigations and observations. Experiments have been carried on at Zwartkops River from time to time, and recently right throughout the year. The report thereon has not yet been published. The dispute waged round the question of the spawning of fish in the river, and the catching of immature fish. Steenbras spawn in the river and remain there; Haarders pass in and out; and Barbel spawn up the river and in the sea. On one occasion great numbers of eggs were found but the species of fish to which they belong was not ascertained.

Mr. Mansergh, who promised to furnish Members with a copy of Dr. Gilchrist's report, stated that on the strength of that report and the opinion of the Board, the close season had again been extended for a year.

Mr. Stephan, with whom Mr. A.H. Reid agreed, remarked that large quantities of Geelbek had been caught in the Zwartkops River. Dr. Gilchrist pointed out that the Geelbek was a warm water fish from the East Coast, and Mr. Stephan added that they had also been caught in the rivers of German West Africa.

Mr. Stephan stated that between November and February he had caught thousands of Bokkoms (young Haarders) of 5 inches and less, in roe, off Mouille Point. Dr. Gilchrist admitted that he had never seen them of such size in roe, and Mr. J.G. Reid remarked that off Blaauwberg they were rarely caught in roe.

Mr. Irwin was of opinion that if the contentions in Mr. Stephan's report are correct, then fishing in rivers should be stopped: if fishing has not gone beyond the danger margin the supply of fish is stationary: and Dr.Gilchrist, whilst desirous of seeing Estuaries closed to fishing, considered that such drastic action should have strong justification. Fish do spawn in rivers but the question is do they spawn more in the rivers than on the seashore. Fish sought sandy or shallow water to escape large fish but he did not think spawning is much injured by netting.

In reply to Mr. A.H. Reid, Dr. Gilchrist stated that a book had recently been published on "Migration of Fish" by Alexander Meek, M.Sc., and Mr. Mansergh promised to procure copies for each Member of the Board.

Mr. Mansergh read the report submitted by Messrs. Shaw and Wrensch in 1913, from which it appears that the evidence

available

available as to the alleged diminution of the fish supply in the Berg River and vicinity varied considerable according to the occupation of the different witnesses - whether set or seine netters - each class considering the occupation of the other detrimental to his calling. It further showed that during the snoek season of four months each year the Berg River fishermen each earned about £130; and that, while evidence of fish spawning in the river was lacking, small fry frequented it in vast quantities: in addition, quantities of immature fish, of no mercantile value, are destroyed. In view thereof, the Officers referred to recommended:-

(1) The permanent prohibition in territorial waters of netting of all descriptions - except the seine - along certain stretches of the Piquetberg and Malmesbury Coasts.

(2) Prohibition for 3 years of every description of netting in the fishing area of the Berg River, and the appointment of a Fishery Officer to study and record the spawning and breeding habits of fish.

(3) Closing of seine and all classes of netting for 5 months in each year along the coast (1st September - 31st January).

(4) Permanent prohibition of all netting within a mile of the Berg River Mouth.

(5) Prohibition of the use of any net with a mesh smaller than $1\frac{3}{4}$ inches from knot to knot.

In reply to Mr. A.H. Reid, Dr. Gilchrist stated that the Australian approached nearest to our fishing conditions having long estuarine rivers - Australian rivers have been closed down but net fishing is not actually condemned.

Mr. Stephan pointed out that other countries spend large sums annually to breed fish, which was conclusive proof that fish require sanctuaries. He suggested that the Fishery Officer should be sent to report on the rivers in German South West and if they are found full of fish, his contention would be proved. He also added that Geelbek used to be caught regularly every year at Langebaan during September but that now they do not appear.

At the request of Mr. Mansergh, Mr. Cripps related what his experiences at Berg River at the time of the enquiry in 1913. He saw countless numbers of very small fish - including Haarders, Elft, white Stompneus of from 1 to 2 inches - caught. Haarders and Bokkoms in roe were also caught. Further up the river the same kind of fish was caught but not in such quantities. Much damage was done to ova through the moss, stones, and debris that got caught in the nets. Seine and stake nets of questionable mesh measurement - cheaply made - were put out at night and on warning of the approach of Police, were hidden. Small fish required sanctuaries.

Mr. Stephan referred to a recent important judgment in the Supreme Court which laid down that the boundary of a man's land is in the middle of the river and questioned its effect on any fishing regulations that might be passed. Mr. van Zyl, however, pointed out that this decision only related to farms where the river is mentioned as a boundary.

Mr. Mansergh pointed out that the closing of all rivers of the Cape Province to net fishing would be a very drastic step, and one that would lead to much agitation and many petitions of protest being sent to the Administrator. He suggested the advisability of ~~approving~~ appointing a Fishery Officer who

could

could be stationed at the Berg River to take observations and make experiments on the spot. This was countered by Mr. van Zyl that unless the River was altogether closed to netting the appointment of a Fishery Officer would serve no practical purpose as under present conditions, it would be impossible to judge to what extent the fish entered the river, whilst Mr. Stephan contended that it would be most unfair, as a compromise, to single out the Berg River for closing: a principle was involved and called for the closing of all rivers. Mr. A.H. Reid strongly endorsed these views.

A further suggestion that the rivers be closed for only one year did not meet with favourable consideration. Mr. van Zyl held that a three years' prohibition was necessary not only for practical experimental work but that a definite break with the fishing community could be made so that they would not be buoyed up with false hopes that they could return to net fishing in a years' time and, for that reason, retain their nets which might besides lead to poaching. Such a prohibition would be no hardship to the fishermen as they do remarkably well during the Snoek Season and could at other times obtain work at the Crawfish factory nearby. With these views Messrs. Stephan and A.H.Reid concurred.

Eventually the following resolutions were put:-

(1) Moved by Mr.Stephan, and seconded by Mr. van Zyl:-

"That all Rivers and Estuaries of the Cape Province be closed definitely to Netting of any description whatever for a period of three years; and that such prohibition of Netting shall also apply to points on the sea shore half a mile on either side from the mouth of such rivers and estuaries and extending half a mile seaward for the whole length between such points".

Carried by 4 votes to 3.

(2) Moved by Mr. A.H. Reid, and seconded by Mr. J.G. Reid:-

"Subject to the adoption of the above Resolution, an Officer be appointed to reside permanently at Berg River for the purpose of studying and reporting on the breeding, spawning, and migratory habits of fish in the River, and of seeing that the regulations are observed".

Carried unanimously.

J. W. Munnik.

SECRETARY.

Confirmed.

24/8/17

CHAIRMAN.

Minutes of Meeting of the Fishery Advisory Board, held on Friday, the 10th August, 1917, at the Huguenot Buildings.

Present: Mr. Mansergh (Chairman), Dr. Gilchrist, and Messrs. Runciman, Van Zyl, Irvine, J.G.Reid, and Wynne. Also Mr. Cripps (Fishery Officer).

Minutes of previous Meeting were read and confirmed.

A letter of regret for not being present owing to Military duties was received from Mr. A. H. Reid.

Snoek: decrease of Size Limit from 24 to 22 inches: Petitions re.

Mr. Mansergh introduced Major Cowper, Mr. Rawbone, and Mr. le Roux, Members of the Provincial Council, who, he said, were interested in the Snoek question and desired to lay before the Board the views of Members of the fishing community whom they represented.

He added that owing to strong representations which have been made to the Administrator, Sir Frederick would be glad if the Board would carefully consider and study the facts put forward by the fishermen and if its decision be adverse to any relief being granted, to favour him with detailed reasons for such a decision.

Major Cowper, on behalf of the Kalk Bay fishermen from whom he had received a deputation, hoped the Board would be able to see its way to recommend a reduction of the size limit to 22 inches. The fishermen are having hard times at present and Snoek is the only available means of making a living. He personally was opposed to any alteration of the law and suggested that the matter could be met by not prosecuting for any infringement thereof. Admiralty regulations handicapped the fishermen in that they could not leave harbour before day-break and had to be back by sunset.

Mr. Rawbone supported generally the application for a reduction in size as a temporary measure.

Mr. le Roux next spoke on behalf of the Hermanus fishermen whose views he pointed out had already been fully aired by the Deputation who waited on the Provincial Secretary on the 30th July. However, he would emphasize that schools of Snoek from 22 to 26 inches visited Hermanus, and all under size, unavoidably caught, had to be returned to the sea. It was quite impossible to measure Snoek whilst alive so that it meant killing them and then, if under size, throwing them back into the sea. This was a dead loss to the fishermen and not justifiable under present conditions. The size limit should be reduced to 22 inches during the duration of the War. Snoek visited Hermanus waters in millions and was the only source of earning a livelihood as geelbeck and kapeljauw were scarce.

Mr. Irwin ~~said that~~ he was quite satisfied that the present high prices for Snoek was the cause of the agitation. The statement on page 11 of the Minutes of Meeting between the Deputation and Provincial Secretary that no Snoek have been exported to Madagascar (which is apparently a mistake for Mauritius) was incorrect. Snoek had been sent to Mauritius and fetched high prices.

Mr. le Roux disagreed, Local people would benefit if more Snoek could be caught. Snoek now cost 10d. each, whereas two and three years ago they only fetched 20/- to 25/- per 100. The fishermen maintained that the movements of fish were greatly influenced by the wind conditions.

Mr. J. G. Reid stated that at Saldanha Bay and neighbouring districts Snoek last year realised 3d. each: this year they were sold at 11d. and 1/1d. each, and some recently fetched as much as 2/- each. There were no small Snoek. Out of two packets recently disposed of, containing 32,000 and 45,000 Snoek, respectively, not more than 4 % were under 24-27 inches.

As "moetjes" are made from small Snoek, of which there is a scarcity at present, the farmers' requirements in that respect cannot be met, hence their complaints.

Mr. le Roux contended that fully 50 % of the fishermens' catches had to be thrown overboard owing to the fish being under size limit. (Mr. Irvine: "The Scarcity of large fish suggest the need for raising not reducing the size limit"). The fishermen have to contend with very bad times which should permit of some relaxation of the regulation. After the War they were quite prepared to favour the enforcement of a regulation whereby there would be a six months' close and a six months' open season, in addition to a size limit of 22 inches.

After the withdrawal of the Provincial Councillors above mentioned, the Chairman read three telegrams addressed by Mr. Stephan from Durban to (1) the Chairman, Fishery Board; (2) Messrs. Stephan Bros; and (3) Mr. A. J. Reid, the essence of which was that Mr. Stephan was strongly opposed to any reduction of the size limit and recommended instead that it be increased to 28 inches. He also stated that any reduction would seriously affect the Mauritius Market.

Mr. Runciman explained that small fish are not wanted at Mauritius hence the shipment of such to that Island, which would inevitably result from a reduction in the size limit, would affect the stability of the Market.

Mr. Irvine agreed. At Hermanus the catches consist mainly of small fish which would be sent there. Recently a very large parcel of Snoek from Gans Bay or Hermanus had been sold for export to Mauritius at a very large figure. Fish is now worth three times as much as last year; line fish had gone up 100 %. Afraid local people would not benefit. The pecuniary inducement to trade elsewhere was too great.

The Chairman intimated that he had wired to all Magistrates along the Western Coast of Province: so far, he had only received a reply from Port Nolloth where only large Snoek had been caught.

Mr. Cripps (Fishery Officer), in reply to a question, stated that the reason why only large fish are caught on the Western Coast is that the Italian fishermen go further seaward. The small snoek hug the coast. He had seen masses of Snoek at Walker Bay from 22 to 24 inches.

The Chairman remarked that the large Snoek apparently passed Hermanus for only the large size appeared at Mossel Bay.

Dr. Gilchrist agreed.

Mr. Runciman was of opinion that the fault lay with the fishermen who did not go out far enough to get in touch with the large fish

The following letter, dated the 4th August, 1917, addressed to Mr. Rawbone by Mr. Barry McMillan, once an officer of the Agricultural Department, was read by the Chairman:-

> "Yesterday I obtained one of the only two large-sized Snoek caught here during the past week. It measured from the bifurcation of the tail to the end of the mouth 39½ inches: it was in roe but the eggs were in a no more advanced stage towards ripeness than those in many roes I have examined recently in Snoek of 22 and 24 inches. The fish was in good condition, proved excellent eating and was free from the parasites so readily found in the body and on the internal organs of "poor snoek".
>
> Means were not at disposal to ascertain its age by an examination of the scales or the vertebrae - even if this

method be applicable to Snoek - but, most probably, it was hatched considerably earlier than a year, may be, two years ago.

I understand that it is generally accepted by authorities on fish that length is by no means the best factor to use in calculating age and that what is called the "winter rings" on the scales is a far more reliable index. In the only work of reference handy to me at the moment, "Migrations of Fish", by Professor Beek, 1916, a table is given, from which I attach an extract, showing that length and age are by no means always proportionate.

If it be admitted that, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, similar variations may hold good in the case of Snoek, then there would seem to be strong support for the statement made at the interview on Monday last that, most probably, a 22 inch Snoek is of the same age, i.e. as much advanced towards maturity as a 24 inch one, even putting aside the fact that the difference in the stages of roe and melt development in these respective lengths is so slight as to be indistinguishable.

No one who pretends to the slightest knowledge of the subject, will maintain that a 24 inch Snoek is an adult fish nor will search, however extended, be likely to discover ripe roe or melt in smoek at this time of the year in this locality, whatever their length may be.

While the foregoing might be used as a strong argument for prohibiting the capture of Snoek during this, the period of roe and melt growth, on the other hand, having adopted a 24 inch limit without, as the deputation was told, any other grounds for so doing beyond that the Board found it in operation years ago, and, further, on its being shown that a 24 inch limit is practically no more a protection than a 22 inch one, it would not be unreasonable, especially under the present abnormal conditions, to make the alteration asked for by the fishermen."

Mr. Cripps explained how the Snoek is caught and stated that it would depend upon the method adopted whether an undersized snoek, returned to the water, would live or not. A reduction in the size limit would probably lead to fishing closer inshore where the smaller fish are found.

Mr. Reid drew attention to the opinion of Mr. Stephan, as expressed at a meeting of the Board on the 17th March, 1916, that the Snoek thrown back into the sea would not die: this would only happen if the hook reached the brain.

Mr. van Zyl commented on the inadvisability of hurriedly arriving at a decision. He moved that the different objections to a reduction in size be brought together in a concise form and circularised among the Members who could then carefully go further into the matter, after which a further meeting of the Board should be called.

This was agreed to.

Confirmed
Warren
L. Chairman. 24 8/17

J W Munnik
Secretary.

30x

Minutes of Meeting of Fishery Advisory Board held at the Huguenot Buildings on Friday, the 24th August.

Present: Mr. Mansergh (Chairman), Dr. Gilchrist, and Messrs. Runciman, Stephan, Van Zyl and Irvin. Mr. Cripps (Fishery Officer).

A letter from Mr. A.H. Reid, expressing regret at being unable to be present owing to military duties was read.

The Minutes of the two previous meetings were confirmed.

Snoek: petitions for reduction in size limit

The Meeting proceeded with the consideration of Mr. Mansergh's notes on the Snoek question, copies of which were circulated among the members of the Board in terms of Mr. Van Zyl's motion at the previous meeting.

Mr. Mansergh stated that all the Magistrates whose jurisdiction extended over the Western coast of the Province had been communicated with by wire and, with the exception of Van Rhynsdorp, all had replied. From their replies it would appear that no small snoek were caught on the Western coast: with few exceptions, they were all over 24 inches. The trouble, however, was that at Hermanus, Gans Bay, and False Bay only the small Snoek appear.

Mr. Stephan contended that the Snoek spawn there and the young ones remain behind until big enough to join the large ones. This theory, however, could only be established by expert investigations.

Mr. Runciman said the question was what loss was sustained through fish under 22" being killed through being caught.

Mr. Irvin considered that reduction in size limit would increase the loss. Are the small fish thrown away or cut into "moetjes". If the latter, then they would probably be sent to Mauritius.

Mr. Stephan very much doubted that the waste approximated 40 to 60 %. Fishermen broke the necks of baby Snoeks of 20" instead of detaching the hooks. By adhering to the latter method of getting rid of undersized Snoek, the present wastage could be reduced. The only recourse was to raise the penalties for contravention of fishery laws.

Mr. Irvin pointed out that the effect of the size limit was that all undersized Snoek was cut up into "moetjes" so that there was practically no waste, owing to the high prices of Snoek fishermen cannot be suffering financially. If the size decreased, the price would probably go up as fish now under-sized would be available for export.

Some amendments and deletions to Mr. Mansergh's notes were moved and passed, and by the unanimous vote of the Board the Secretary was instructed to advise the Administrator in terms of the amended notes, which read as follows:-

"In the opinion of the Board, the distribution of Snoek is broadly as follows:- on the Western Coast down to Cape Point large (i,e. fish mature and over 24 inches) Snoek; the immature Snoek frequent the bays and other inlets Eastward from Cape Point, including False Bay, Hermanus, etc., to perhaps Mossel Bay, and these places are their nurseries, on which their development depends. The Board believes that probably it will be found that between Cape Point and Mossel Bay the large fish remain some distance out to sea, but evidence on this point is lacking and the subject is one for investigation.

The Board does not consider it to be proved that it is impossible to confine the bulk of the Snoek catches to the Regulation size (24") and over if proper measures are taken, e.g., if boats go further out to sea and shift from fishing grounds when shoals of small fish are found to be running.

On the

On the West Coast, the fishermen invariably land large fish.

According to the information before the Board, and also in accordance with the information supplied by the Petitioners, even the 24" limit is not sufficient to protect immature fish. The mature limit has not been ascertained but 28 to 30 inches has been recommended for adoption.

The Board has reason to believe that quite recently Snoek has been exported to Mauritius from the Hermanus area - hence the statement that no export market exists is considered to be incorrect. The Board is of opinion that the opportunity of operating in the export market is connected with the present movement but the export market at Mauritius would, the Board believes, be injured if flooded with small fish.

With the high prices for fish now ruling, reduction of size limit would induce fishermen to catch more small fish and they would be disinclined to go farther afield in search of the larger sizes which the Board believes to be one important factor in the solution of present difficulties.

The Board considers that the protection of the fish supply in the general interest of the community should be its first consideration despite some inconvenience to a small section of the community. The alleged absence of large fish close inshore appears to the Board to be a strong reason for strict protection of the immature fish.

The Board does not accept as sound the argument that because 24" fish are not mature no injury can be occasioned by allowing the capture of 22" fish which are also immature. Obviously freedom to capture the smaller size without restriction will simply license a greater destruction of immature individuals.

The Board realizes that some wastage of food material may now be occasioned by the injury or killing and throwing away of fish under 24", but the Board has no reliable data as to what such wastage may be, In the opinion of the Board, no great wastage should occur if the fish on capture are properly handled. It feels that even the present size limit is too small and should be raised, but investigations on this point should be immediately proceeded with by the Fishery Officer."

Dr. Gilchrist, whilst agreeing in the main with the Board's recommendations desired it to be placed on record that he was not absolutely certain that the means taken to protect Snoek are infallible, nor is he quite certain that the Snoek would be destroyed by capturing immature ones. Young herrings are destroyed but the supply has not decreased.

Infringement of Fishery Laws.

Mr. Stephan moved that the Administrator be approached to raise the penalties for contravention of fishery laws and to empower Magistrates to confiscate fishing gear.

Agreed to.

Seals.

Mr. Irvin moved:- "That representations be made to the Union Government regarding the damage done to fish by Seals in the territorial waters of the Cape Province coupled with strong recommendations that the regulations prohibiting their killing be repealed." Agreed to.

Grading of Snoek.

Mr. Stephan stated that Mauritius had been compelled to appoint a grader to deal with fish imported from South Africa. Much of the Snoek was not fit for consumption. Stability of market was wanted. Legitimate industries should not be handicapped by people who cure snoek in yards, etc. Fish

should

should be graded in the same way as fruit and mealies are graded.

Mr. Irvin agreed and considered that in order to prevent small snoek leaving the country permission should only be granted for the exportation of the large fish.

Mr. Stephan accordingly moved "That Snoek for export be graded into qualities, and that fishermen be prohibited from selling for consumption Snoek cured in backyards, etc."

Agreed to.

Honorary Fishery Inspectors.

Mr. Irvin suggested the appointment of Honorary Fishery Inspectors: such appointments would prove a great boon.

The Chairman pointed out that unless such Inspectors were sworn in as Special Constables their services would be useless as they would possess no power to arrest. Against this, however, had to be placed the fact that appointments as Special Constables could not be lightly made.

Set Net in Vicinity of Kalk Bay Pier.

The Chairman intimated that the Railway Administration had complained about the serious interference to fishing off the Pier at Kalk Bay caused by a Set Net in its vicinity.

He proposed to issue a proclamation prohibiting set-netting within a radius of one-half nautical mile from the outer extremity of the Main Pier at Kalk Bay Harbour.

Approved.

Confirmed
Chairman
19/9/17

Secretary.

Minutes of Meeting Held in the Administrator's Office on Saturday, the 1st September, 1917.

Present: The Hon. Sir Frederic de Waal (Administrator), Mr. Mansergh (Provincial Secretary); Drs. Peringuey, Beattie, and van der Riet (representing the Board on Scientific and Industrial Research appointed by the Union Government); and Dr. Gilchrist, and Messrs. Stephan, J. G. Reid, and G. B. van Zyl, M.P.C., (representing the Fishery Advisory Board).

Intimations of regret at being unable to be present were received from Messrs. Runciman, A. H. Reid, and G. D. Irvin.

The Administrator stated that the Board on Scientific and Industrial Research desired to make certain recommendations in connection with fishery industry and as these recommendations would naturally have to be submitted to the Fishery Board, he thought the most expeditious course would be for the two bodies to meet and discuss the matter.

Marine Biological Survey:

Dr. Peringuey, on behalf of the Board, stated the first point was the necessity of resuming the Marine Biological Survey. This survey was begun many years ago but, owing to financial difficulties, on the one hand, and, on the other, to the belief that sufficient results had been achieved, was not completed. Since then the demand for, and the price of, fish had increased; new markets had been opened, and an export trade has commenced. The demand for fish is likely to increase, the supply is now inadequate, and further surveys of likely fishing grounds are imperative. There is, besides, reason to believe that certain fishing areas are being depleted.

The refitting of the "Pieter Faure" for survey work would involve a preliminary expenditure of £2,000, whilst the annual cost thereafter would be £6,000, i.e. £500 per month. An alternative scheme would be the hire, at a moderate cost, of a local trawler when fish are plentiful. This would mean that the survey would depend on the quantity of fish obtainable by trawler - an awkward, unreliable determining factor, so that it would be far more desirable to employ the "Pieter Faure".

The Administrator pointed out that the jurisdiction of the Cape Provincial Administration only applied to the waters bordering on the coast of the Cape Province. An investigation of this nature should rather apply to the whole of the Union of South Africa than to a portion thereof.

Dr. Peringuey replied that there was a movement in Natal for a similar survey so that the co-operation of the two Provinces was possible.

Sir Frederic inclined to the view that one supervision was more desirable than two. A general survey of the whole coast under one administration would bring about more valuable results. So far as separate action was possible nothing could be done by the Cape Administration this year as no funds were available. The revenue from fisheries was small. Although the control of Fisheries had been handed to the Province the Union Government had retained control of certain matters, e.g., seals. If seals could be kept back, why not Survey? The surveying of fishing areas was a matter of interest to the whole Union: it meant an export trade, cheapening the cost of living not only to the people of the Cape Province but the whole Union. In the general interest of the fishing industry, he was quite prepared to abdicate any right that may be vested in him in regard to this particular aspect of the industry, and he would strongly support a recommendation that the Union Government should undertake the survey of the coast

of the

of the whole Union. If the Board on Scientific and Technical Research, and the Fishery Board agreed, immediate representations should be made to the Union Government who had many sources of revenue, and who would, no doubt, be able to make provision for the survey work contemplated. If their representations were unsuccessful, it would be time enough to look him up and see what can be done from a provincial point of view.

Dr. van der Riet claimed a further point for the contention that the question of Survey was an Union one, namely:- the development of a fleet of modern fishing boats through the discovery of new fishing grounds would be a valuable asset in the promotion of national defence.

The excellent results obtained by the "Pieter Faure" justified the continuance of the Survey and it would be a pity if the Administration handed over any control to the Union Government.

Sir Frederic emphasized that it would be only in respect to the Survey, which seemed more of an Union matter: he had no intention to part with any control over the fisheries.

The Meeting unanimously agreed with Sir Frederic's suggestion that the Board on Scientific and Industrial Research should approach the Union Government to take up the matter of survey. Sir Frederic promised to give any recommendations in this respect his strong support.

Statistics:

Dr. Peringuey then referred to the great necessity that exists for increasing facilities for obtaining complete and reliable statistics, and make accessible those already in the possession of the Administration. Statistics were great factors in the development of the fishing industry and the cost of collection should not be an insuperable barrier.

Sir Frederic replied that if the amount at present devoted to the collection of statistics is not sufficient, it could be increased.

General

Dr. Peringuey remarked that there were many other matters of importance connected with the fishing industry but he would content himself with specially referring to (1) the propagation of fish; (2) extent of the habitat of cray-fish; (3) more complete supervision of fishery regulations; (3) quantity of separate fishes captured, all of which required serious consideration.

Sir Frederic replied that if the Board would submit their views in extenso on these points he would be prepared to forward them to the Fishery Board for their advice.

Mr. Stephan complained of the difficulty in enforcing the fishery regulations. The Fishery Board was handicapped through its recommendations not being enforcable by law. The penalty for breaches of the regulations should be much more severe.

Sir Frederic replied that any recommendations on that point would receive his consideration and, if necessary, the Ordinance could be amended in that respect.

Seaweed:

Dr. Peringuey considered that kelp or sea-weed was a great asset as a potash salt producer. Nothing is known of the extent of the kelp areas and a survey thereof, which is imperative if this natural source of potash is to be tackled successfully in a commercial way, could be linked with the fisheries survey. Owing to war conditions, potash - a most valuable constituent in fertilisers - was very scarce and therefore of very great commercial value.

Sir Frederic pointed out that this was an industrial matter, and would have to be dealt with by the Department of Mines & Industries.

Dr. Peringuey: The two surveys are closely linked together.

Sir Frederic pointed out that the Provincial Administration could only deal with matters delegated by Parliament. In fishery matters he would be only too glad to render whatever services are necessary. If it was considered desirable to go into the question of the extent of seaweed occurrence and the Union Government delegated the work to the Provincial Administration, the Administration would not worry if the expenditure to be incurred was small, but if a large amount was involved then the Administration could only act as a Contractor to the Union Government.

Dr. van der Riet raised the point whether potash was obtainable from other than growing plants: in that case, the question arose as to whether seaweed was not essential for the protection of fish. In addition, it was questionable whether the extraction of potash from seaweed was of economic value. In America and elsewhere the results had not been altogether favourable.

Sir Frederic intimated that if at any time it is contemplated to remove seaweed in bulk for potash extraction and it could be proved that seaweed was essential for the protection of fish; the matter would be of very great importance and he would certainly take immediate action.

The Meeting then terminated.

Confirmed
Lawrence Wausendt
Chairman
19/9/17

J W Munnik
Secretary

Minutes of Meeting of Fishery Advisory Board held at Huguenot Buildings on the 18th September, 1917.

Present: Mr. Mansergh (Chairman), Dr. Gilchrist, and Messrs. J. G. Reid, A. H. Reid, Van Zyl, and Stephan. Also Mr. Cripps (Fishery Officer).

(1) Snoek: Age of Maturity.

Mr. Mansergh read the following report by Dr. Gilchrist:

"With reference to your note as to the best methods of carrying on the investigations into the size limit of the Snoek, it will be necessary to examine as many as possible from 22 inches upwards, in order to discover at what size maturity is reached. The examination should be particularly of females as there is reason to believe that males reach maturity at a smaller size than the females. I think it has been established now that a size of 24 inches is not mature. We also know the size of a mature egg of the snoek (.95 mm.) so that it is easy to determine whether any given individual female is mature or not. The examination would have to be carried on at different seasons but the probability is that spawning takes place towards the end of winter or the beginning of the summer months and this would be the best time to carry on the work.

The fisheries officer may not be able to measure the eggs but if any loose clear eggs are found in the ovary they are probably near maturity and can be preserved in 5 % formalin for subsequent microscopic examination".

Messrs. Stephan and J. G. Reid expressed their willingness to assist Dr. Gilchrist in every possible way and the latter gentleman promised to secure the co-operation of Mr. Irvine (who was absent).

Eventually it was decided that Dr. Gilchrist should draw up a memorandum as to his requirements; that the offices of Messrs. Stephan and Reid (and possibly of Mr. Irvine) be accepted in respect of fish on the Western Coast, and that the Fishery Officer should go to Hermanus to see what assistance could be obtained in that centre.

(2) Crawfish Close Season and Sanctuaries.

Mr. van Zyl drew attention to the notice of the 8th May last on the question of sanctuaries, and after full discussion it was resolved that the administrator be approached to declare the following areas as sanctuaries:-

(a) An area in or near Hout Bay.
(b) Oude Kraal.
(c) From end of drain opposite Flash Lighthouse to Old Mouille Point Lighthouse.
(d) From end of Breakwater, via end of sewage pipe off Woodstock, thence to the American wreck and on to Fort George.
(e) North Bay.
(f) Jacob's Bay.
(g) Steenberg's Cove to Brandhuis.

The prohibited area to extend ½ mile seaward from and between specific points on the mainland, and in such area no fishing of Crawfish for bait to be allowed.

The

The Secretary was also instructed to ask that a draft copy of the proposed Proclamation when framed be submitted for the information of the Board.

In respect of the Close Seasons, it was decided to recommend the following:-

A four months' close season in Areas Nos. 1 to 3, commencing on the following dates:-

No.1 Area: Cape Point to Duiker Point: from 1st October.

No.2 Area: Duiker Point to Cape Columbine: from 16th November.

No.3 Area: Cape Columbine to Baboon Point: from 16th December.

J. W. Munnik.

SECRETARY.

Confirmed.

Lewis Mansergh

CHAIRMAN.

Minutes of Meeting of Fishery Advisory Board held in the Office of the Provincial Secretary on Wednesday, the 3rd October, 1917.

Present: Mr. Mansergh (Chairman), Dr. Gilchrist, and Messrs. Runciman, Irvin, and Stephan. Also Mr. Cripps (Fishery Officer).

An apology was received from Mr. van Zyl for unavoidable absence.

Net Fishing in Little Brak River, Mossel Bay.

Mr. Mansergh explained that the Proclamation at present in force which prohibits netting of any description within that portion of the Little Brak River from its junction with the Klein Doorn River to the sea for one year would expire on the 6th October.

The Mossel Bay Angling and Acclimatisation Society, supported by the Magistrate, has applied for the closing for a further period of two years of the whole of the Little Brak River and Klein Doorn Rivers, with the exception of that portion of the Little Brak River which lies between where property "The Hoek" is divided from property "Barsgat" and the Railway Bridge.

The Divisional Council, in submitting petitions from 160 signatories, recommends that the Little Brak River be left open for netting purposes from the Railway Bridge to Twee River.

Mr. Stephan strongly recommended the closing of the whole of the rivers to netting. The Board should adhere to the principle laid down at its Meeting of the 29th May, 1917, that all rivers and estuaries be closed definitely to netting of any description for a period of three years.

Dr. Gilchrist did not agree. He instanced Australia where a number of rivers is left open to netting. Messrs. Runciman and Stephan did not consider that the conditions are similar - here the rivers are not so large and wide.

Mr. Mansergh deprecated the passing of sweeping resolutions to which effect could not be given. To go the whole length would cause great local agitation. Could the Board furnish the Administrator with sufficient data to justify such a course of action. He suggested the re-enactment of the present Proclamation for a year, and that in the interim Dr. Gilchrist visit the area affected and make a personal investigation.

In reply to Mr. Stephan, Dr. Gilchrist stated that the closing of the river from the sea to the Railway Bridge was essential owing to indiscriminate netting, especially during the holiday times.

After further discussion, Mr. Runciman moved the following resolution, which was passed:-

> "That for a period of six months netting for fish be prohibited in the whole of the Little Brak and Klein Doorn Rivers, with the exception of that portion of the Little Brak River formed by its junction with the Klein Doorn River and the Railway Bridge; and that early steps be taken for personal investigation into the real facts of the case by either the Marine Adviser or the Fishery Officer".

Sanctuaries

Sanctuaries.

A rough schedule of the proposed Proclamation dealing with Sanctuaries for crawfish was submitted to the Board. After consideration some alterations were agreed upon and finally it was resolved that the schedule, as amended, be circularised among the members of the Board.

J. W. Munnik.

SECRETARY.

Confirmed.

CHAIRMAN.

Minutes of Meeting of the Fisheries Advisory Board held in the Office of the Provincial Secretary on Monday, the 26th November, 1917.

Present: Mr. Mansergh (Chairman), Dr. Gilchrist, and Messrs. Runciman, J. G. Reid, and Stephan. Also Mr. Cripps (Fisheries Officer).

Sanctuaries for Crawfish:

Mr. Mansergh stated that the object of the meeting was to consider finally the sanctuaries agreed upon at the last meeting of the Board. He had caused the Secretary to circularise a letter which he proposed to submit to the Administrator. The creation of these sanctuaries is bound to cause a disturbance. The suggestion has been made that prior to the publication of the proclamation a notice of the contents of the Proclamation should be issued so as not to come down unexpectedly on the Canners. Certain discrepancies appeared to exist in the different areas, i.e. No.3 area had far less sanctuaries than No.2. Let the Board consider what telling points any opposition could bring forth so that the matter could be considered from all points.

Mr. Stephan strongly resented the idea that No.3 area was unduly favoured. There was not a quarter of the factories or an eighth of the boats found further South. The too rough seas prevented fishing all through the open season and were thus a protection to the fish. There were also more natural sanctuaries than existed in No.2 area. In addition, the fishing in the latter area was very concentrated - making the need of sanctuaries absolutely necessary - whereas in the North much less fishing took place and sanctuaries were not so necessary. The North had a larger fishing area but a shorter season. The idea of sanctuaries was not to penalise a Canner in a large area, but to prevent places being fished out. He predicted that the sanctuaries would eventually be found in the possession of the males and not the females.

Dr. Gilchrist pointed out that in the South, places were selected where the fish spawn, but in the North a different principle had been applied.

Messrs. Stephan and Reid disagreed. The three places selected in No.3 area were the known haunts of crawfish but had been fished out.

Mr. Runciman said that the idea of sanctuaries to him was not to make large sanctuaries where little fishing was done but to prevent overfishing in the more strongly fished waters.

Mr. Stephan pointed out that in the North they used open boats which could not go far out. No reasonable argument could be advanced against the sanctuaries as proposed. Plenty of place existed in No.3 area for the erection of further canning factories.

Mr. Reid suggested a meeting with the Canners and a few representative fishermen.

This was eventually agreed to.

Herring Ova.

A discussion arose as to the best means of dealing with the ova when it arrives in South Africa. Dr. Gilchrist stated that ova will be kept under observation at the Marine Station, and when the fish reach the fry stage they would be released in the open sea. The great thing is to know whether the ova can be hatched out here. Mr. Stephan was anxious that the fry stage should also be kept under observation and, after several suggestions had been considered, it was decided om Mr. Stephan's

suggestion that Dr. Gilchrist should inspect the Municipal Bathing Pool at Three Anchor Bay, which is not used now for bathing purposes and which, if available, could probably be improved to meet the Board's requirements.

Military restrictions in regard to Fishing Boats:

Mr. Stephan asked whether recommendations could not be made to the Military to withdraw some of the irksome and unnecessary restrictions placed upon the fishermen of Table Bay. Mr. Runciman agreed. Mr. Mansergh stated that he intended soon to have an interview with the Military Authorities on the subject, when he would do his best to get the fishermen as much freedom as possible.

Frozen Fish for Export to England:

Mr. Mansergh read a telegram received from Pretoria stating that the High Commissioner in London enquires whether it would be possible to send large shipments of frozen fish to England. Both ~~Neither~~ Mr. Reid and ~~nor~~ Mr. Stephan were of opinion that the catch of fish was not sufficient for the purpose. At the suggestion, however, of these gentlemen, Mr. Mansergh promised to communicate with Mr. Irvin and with Messrs. Wardner and Enksen, South African Fisheries, Mossel Bay.

Board Meetings:

In order to meet the convenience of Mr. Runciman, it was decided to hold the meetings of the Board in future on Tuesday mornings at about 11.30.

J. W. Munnik.
SECRETARY.

316

Minutes of Meeting between Fisheries Advisory Board and representatives of Canning Companies and Italian fishermen to discuss certain proposals for additional protective measures in regard to Crawfish. (Tuesday 11th December 1917).

Present: Mr. Mansergh (Chairman) and Messrs. A. H. Reid, J. G. Reid, Stephan, Irvin (Members of the Board), Mr. Cripps (Fisheries Officer), and Messrs. J. Daneel, R. S. F. Lewis, R. Ovenstone, Hickson, Youlle, Craig, Devisme, Lindstrom, and five Italian Fishermen (representing the Canning Factories and Fishermen).

Mr. Mansergh, in welcoming the representatives, hoped that the additional measures the Board would lay before them would be considered from the point of view of the importance of the Crawfish Industry. The Board has viewed with anxiety constant allegations as to a diminution in the supply of the fish: indeed, several Members have long feared that unless early measures are taken to counteract this the industry would soon be placed in a serious position. Protective measures in the past have taken the form of size limit, preservation of female in berry, and close seasons: it is now felt strongly that these protective measures are not enough. The additions proposed are the creation at certain spots along the coast of Sanctuaries, which would be permanently closed, or at least until it could be clearly ascertained whether they are effective in increasing the supply of crawfish. This decision had been come to after careful debate and only after full conviction that action on the lines of the proposals now submitted is very necessary. As the Executive Committee would require a clear case before sanctioning these additional protective measures, the approval of the Canners would naturally strengthen the recommendations of the Board.

Mr. Daneel desired to know what steps would be taken to enforce the regulations if the recommendations were approved. The present regulations are a dead letter. Fish under size are now sold in the market. Patrolling of the places affected would be a difficult matter.

Mr. Mansergh hoped, pending the establishment of special patrols, to secure the observance of the regulations by police supervision and special visits of inspection. Breaches of the regulations have occurred but drastic control has not been exercised up to now: Supervision would be stiffened within reason - so far as future necessity required.

Mr. Hickson claimed that if the Table Bay areas as framed are passed the Factories might as well be closed permanently. The main supply of fish during February and March came from the area "Lighthouse to Breakwater". Mr. Lewis concurred. In reply to Mr. Daneel it was admitted that the above area was fished last year for a week. Objection was also made to the inclusion of Bok Bay where it was said that the finest fish - small but of a different species - were found.

In reply to Mr. Ovenstone, who desired to know what fish it was sought to protect by the Sanctuaries, Mr. Mansergh stated that the Board's intention was to protect both males and females: to some of the places males would resort and to others females. It had not been definitely established that the male required protection - we were still working in the dark - but obviously these areas, if established, would become sources of supply to the neighbouring waters, as all fish within them would be uniformly protected.

Mr. Ovenstone pointed out that very few females were found at the Lighthouse during February and March last year, whereas at Oudekraal - a breeding place of crawfish - females were in the majority.

Mr. Mansergh's intimation, in response to an enquiry from Mr. Daneel, that no fishing for bait would be permitted in the sanctuaries drew a protest from that gentleman, who pointed out that there were one hundred boats whose occupants earned their livelihood by fishing for bait. Mr. Mansergh pointed out how much more difficult would become the control of these areas if exemption was granted to "bait catchers".

Mr. Lewis was of opinion that the views of the coloured fishermen and their dependents, who numbered about 4,000 (including boat cleaners, helpers, families, etc.) should be obtained as well, as they would be materially affected by the proposals.

Mr. Lewis did not consider that there would be any diversion of opinion as to the necessity of sanctuaries but the question was whether other sites - less burdensome and equally effective - could not be chosen. This view was apparently held by all present.

In reply to Mr. Irvin, Mr. Cripps stated that the sites selected, for which he was not alone responsible, were chosen for the fact that they were the haunts not only of female fish in berry but immature fish.

Mr. Mansergh pointed out that if the sites selected did not commend themselves to the Canners and fishermen the Board would be glad to be favoured with their suggestions.

Petersen Georgio, an Italian, held that the sanctuaries proposed for Table Bay were too drastic.

Mr. Ovenstone claimed that the Canners had already instituted sanctuaries. Last year - 15th May to 15th June - they vetoed any fishing for females at Oudekraal. Oudekraal, however, was not mentioned as a proposed sanctuary.

Mr. Stephan held that the supply of Crawfish near the Lighthouse was diminishing every year. For thirty years it had been known as the place of concentration of large quantities of crawfish. It was in consequence of this knowledge that the first Crawfish Factory at the Cape was established there. Where are the fish now? It had taken about 40 years to fish the place out. There was very strong reason, therefore, to proclaim the place a sanctuary.

Mr. J. G. Reid suggested that Canners should hold a special meeting to discuss the matter between themselves and also discuss it with the Italian and Coloured Fishermen; and thereafter make a joint recommendation to the Board.

Mr. Mansergh gave the suggestion his cordial approval. The Board was inspired by one idea only, the good of the Industry. The Canners must, however, realize that for this purpose it might be necessary that some sacrifices be made by them.

The plan of the Coast shewing the sites for the proposed Sanctuaries would be available for the meeting and, if the Canners so desired, a few copies on a smaller plan could be prepared.

The suggestion of Mr. Reid was adopted and the meeting terminated.

J. W. Munnik.

SECRETARY.

Confirmed.

Lewis Mansergh

CHAIRMAN.

Minutes of Meeting of Fisheries Advisory Board held in the Office of the Provincial Secretary on Tuesday, the 5th of February, 1918.

Present : Mr.Mansergh (Chairman), Dr.Gilchrist, and Messrs A.H.Reid, J.G.Reid, Irvin, and Stephan. Also Mr.Gripps (Fisgery Officer).

(1) Sanctuaries for Crayfish.

Mr.Mansergh stated that the Canners had in accordance with the special wish expressed by them at their meeting with the Board, on the 11th December, held a meeting at which were present representatives of the Coloured and Italian fishermen.

The Canners were in favour of the principle of sanctuaries which, however, they considered should be confined to Oude Kraal, Bok Bay. North Bay, and St.Helena Bay ; but the Coloured and Italian fishermen in general were opposed to the sanctuaries, as they considered that the Crayfish were sufficiently protected by nature and the existing regulations : in addition, any restriction in respect of fishing grounds would seriously interfere with their livelihood without contributing materially to the protection of Crayfish.

Mr.Stephan pointed out that the Canners at their meeting had also approved of Jacob's Bay as a sanctuary. Mr.J.G.Reid and Mr.Cripps confirmed this view.

Mr.Cripps considered that the area within a radius of a ¼ mile of the Woodstock sewer should be proclaimed a sanctuary, as numerous young crayfish and females congregate there.

Mr.Stephan was of opinion that the creation of sanctuaries did away with the necessity of Close Seasons. When a certain area is closed the Canners of that area would, owing to the present demand for and increased price of fish, concentrate in the adjoining area. This was inevitable nowadays as it paid a Canner to go farther afield.

Mr.Mansergh pointed out that the Board was commited to a policy of four months' close season, with which the Canners agreed. Sanctuaries were in the nature of an additional precaution not an alternative.

Mr.Stephan considered that, if the Close Seasons are to remain, Canners should not only not be allowed to can Crayfish when the area in which their factories are situated is closed to crayfish catching, but that they should also not be allowed to fish outside such prescribed area.

Mr.Mansergh doubted whether it would be possible to legislate on such lines. As, however, no good purpose would be served by the Board discussing a matter on which the legal position was uncertain, he suggested that Mr.Stephan should put his proposal in a concrete form so that legal opinion could be obtained. This, Mr Stephan promised to do.

Dr.Gilchrist, on an appeal from Mr.J.G.Reid, for his views, stated that in so far as sanctuaries afforded protection to crayfish, they met with his approval. Sanctuaries may be advantageous but this had still to be proved. Crayfish migrate very considerably and the question is whether they would resort to the sanctuaries.

Mr.Irvin hoped that efficient machinery would be established to watch the development of the sanctuaries and note results. Mr.Stephan urged ~~for~~ the need of more drastic penalties ; owing to the difficulty of catching anyone infringing the regulations, fishermen could afford to take liberties therefore the punishment in case of a conviction should be severe.

Mr.Mansergh pointed out that few ~~precautions~~ prosecutions have taken place up to the present. As the step suggested by Mr.Stephan would require legislative action, he suggested that it would be advisable for a while to await developments.

Eventually it was agreed to recommend the following places as sanctuaries for Crayfish :-

(1) Oude Kraal ; (2) Bok Bay ; (3) North Bay; (4) St. Helena Bay ; (5) Jacob's Bay ; and (6) Area within ½ mile radius of the Woodstock sewer.

(2) Close Seasons.

The following close seasons for Crayfish were agreed to:-

(1) Area No.1 : 1st October to 31st January.
(2) Area No.2 : 16th October to 15th February.
(3) Area No.3 : 16th December to 15th April.

(3) Time of Meeting of Board.

The Secretary read a letter from Mr.Van Zyl stating that it was impossible for him to be present at any meetings of the Board, as at present arranged, as he had in the first place a standing engagement for every Tuesday morning and secondly the morning was most difficult for anyone in the legal profession to get away from office.

The Chairman was given ~~free~~ full discretionary power in regard to the calling of meetings in the future.

J. W. Munnik.
SECRETARY.

Confirmed.

Lawrie Mansergh
Chairman.
26.4.18.

Minutes of Meeting of Fisheries Advisory Board held in the Office of the Provincial Secretary on Friday, the 26th of April, 1918. 320.

Present : Mr. Mansergh (Chairman), Dr. Gilchrist, and Messrs. Runciman, Wynne, Stephan and Irvin, also Mr.Cripps(Fisheries Officer.)

(1) Trawling in Mossel Bay.

Mr. Mansergh explained that Messrs A.J.Vintcent and F. van Wyk, members of the Provincial Council, had been approached by the Coloured Vigilance Society at Mossel Bay through a Mr. Olsen to protect against trawling in Mossel Bay which, it was alleged, seriously interfered with fishing. It was urged that trawling should be prohibited in these waters from five to ten miles from the shore. Mr. Mansergh also read the Law Advisers opinion as to what constituted territorial waters, in which Advocate Swift considered, so far as Mossel Bay was concerned, territorial waters embraced all waters within three mile distance from the undulations of the coast.

Mr. Stephan considered that trawlers should be compelled to keep outside a three mile limit along the whole coast of South Africa. Such a limit was recognised in all European waters and was, in fact, universal.

Mr. Irvin quite approved of a three mile limit. He admitted that numerous immature fish were, at times, caught by trawlers but it was quite unavoidable. It was false economy to throw such fish - which are crushed to death by the larger fish - back into the sea, and they could be usefully turned into fertilisers. There were thousands of trawlers off the British Coast yet their activities did not appear to affect other fishing ; it therefore seemed strange to him that the few trawlers in South African waters should be seriously affecting the fishing here.

Dr. Gilchrist questioned whether the imposition of a three mile limit would not detrimentally affect the Mossel Bay Trawling Co. The best trawling area was within the three mile limit off the Mossel Bay Coast.

Mr. Stephan hoped that the Board would one day prohibit altogether netting in rivers, and the three mile limit was therefore from his point of view, essential.

Ultimately it was decided as a preliminary step, that communications be sent to the following trawling Companies stationed in the Cape Province, viz :-

(1) Messrs Messina, Coles & Searle, Port Elizabeth.
(2) Messrs Irvin & Johnson, Cape Town.
(3) The South African Fisheries, Mossel Bay

to ascertain whether there was any serious objection to the prohibition of trawling three miles from any part of the coast of the Cape Province.

In connection with the question of the destruction of immature fish and their conversion into fertilisers, it was moved :-

" That the catching and destruction of immature fish by trawlers is unavoidable ; and that the conversion of such fish into fertilisers is of bebefit to the country ".

This was agreed to.

(2) Lourens River Pollution.

Mr. Runciman reviewed Dr. Versfeld's analytical findings on the water submitted to him for analysis, and considered that the assertion in the first report, that :-

" This substance may be considered to consist of a normal Sulphate and free Sulphuric acid and consequently, if this amount of pollution is constantly taking place, it is more than likely that animal life in False Bay will be considerably affected ".

was most serious. If fish are killed by the acids, would they in turn, if eaten by other fish, affect such fish. Dr. Gilchrist did not think so.

Mr. Cripps stated that the fishermen attributed the dearth of fish to the acids entering the Bay from the river. He had personally made a local inspection and could not find evidence to confirm their contention. He found no dead fish along the beach and enquiries among the fishermen agreed with his finding in this respect.

Mr. Stephan moved that a communication be addressed to the Cape Explosives Ltd, explaining the nature of the fishermen's complaints and enquiring whether they had any suggestions to make for reducing the poisonous nature of the acids entering the Lourens River from the factory.

This was agreed to.

(3) Netting in the Zwartkops River.

Mr. Stephan raised the point as to whether his resolution of May last prohibiting netting in all Rivers did not cover the case of netting in the Zwartkops River.

Mr. Mansergh stated that it was not possible to ~~get~~ give effect altogether to the resolution as it stood.

After a short history of the position by Mr. Wynne, Mr. Stephan moved that the Zwartkops River be closed permanently to Netting. Mr. Irvin seconded. Dr. Gilchrist had no objection to the prohibition. He was scientifically not assured that the objections to Netting on account of spawning was valid. The matter was purely a local one and, as the river was more suitable for sporting fishermen he would not oppose the resolution. The resolution was agreed to.

(4) Pollution of the Zwartkops River.

Mr. Wynne moved that enquiries be instituted as to the effect acids discharged from the Woolwashing Factory at Uitenhage had on fish in the Zwartkops River.

This was agreed to.

J. W. Munnik.

SECRETARY.

Confirmed.

Lennie Leonard

CHAIRMAN. 10. 12. 1918.

Minutes of Meeting of Fisheries Board held at Hugeunot Buildings on the 10th December, 1918.

PRESENT: Mr Mansergh (Chairman), Dr Gilchrist, and Messrs J. G. and A. H. Reid, Stephan, and Irvin. Also Mr Treadwell (as Fisheries Officer).

The Secretary expressed the regrets of Mr Runciman who was unable to be present.

(1) Death of Mr Cripps.

Mr Mansergh moved a resolution of sympathy and condolence with the family of the late Mr Cripps (Fisheries Officer), who was a victim of Spanish Influenza. He eulogised the excellent work which had been performed by Mr Cripps. Mr J. G. Reid seconded and Members rose in silence in support of the resolution.

(2) Appointment of Mr Treadwell as Fisheries Officer.

Mr Mansergh introduced Mr Treadwell, of his Department, as Fisheries Officer. He pointed out that fishery work was of two kinds (i) outside or police; (ii) inside or administrative. The latter will be conducted by Mrs Treadwell, and in regard to former he will arrange for inspection of factories, etc., from time to time and will utilise the police in matters of prosecutions, etc. Townetting and surveying will be performed by an officer under control of Dr Gilchrist.

(3) Close Season for Crawfish North of Baboon Point.

Mr Mansergh remarked on absence of Close Season for Crawfish North of Baboon Point and, as a Canning Company was now working at Lambert's Bay and another was in course of construction it was necessary, in order to accord uniformity of treatment to Canners, that a close season, similar perhaps to the one for No. 3 Area, be proclaimed. As, however, time was short, he suggested a four months' close season from the 22nd December.

Mr Stephan contended that scientific data as to the condition, habits, etc., of crawfish in that area were not available. The question of a close season had purposely been left in abeyance so that such data could be obtained. Mr Lindstrum, who is canning at Lambert's Bay, had only packed 1,100 cases for the year: there had not been more than a month's fishing. He approved of a close season but not one based on a haphazard guess. He admitted principle of four months' close season but declared it was impossible to say what dates were suitable. Investigations should be made and a close season proclaimed when fish became unfit.

Mr J. G. Reid emphasized need of inspectors - one was useless. It was difficult to get reliable information with different seasons: fish only got 1½ months' rest. He suggested one close season along the whole coast from, say, 15th October to 15th February.

Mr Stephan agreed. He expected greater results from the sanctuaries than from the close seasons.

Dr Gilchrist stated that Mr Hunter, working under his control, was in constant touch with the sanctuaries, and the results of observations were being recorded. It might be necessary to extend such scientific investigations northwards.

Mr Irvin dwelt on the necessity of such scientific investigations. Appointment of Inspectors was essential. He wanted to know why canners were always changing their minds as to close seasons. It would be unfair to canners in proclaimed areas if area North of Baboon Point is not closed.

Mr

Mr Stephan was agreeable to a close season if scientific investigations were carried on.

Mr J. G. Reid moved "THAT a Close Season for Crawfish be proclaimed between Baboon Point and North of Orange River from the 22nd December, 1918, to the 22nd April, 1919; and that the Fisheries Officer be despatched to investigate and report, for the information of the Board, as to the condition of Crawfish within that area".

Mr Stephan seconded. Agreed to.

(4) Uniform Close Season for Crawfish.

In connection with Mr J. G. Reid's suggestion for a uniform close season for crawfish, Mr Irvin was opinion that pending its consideration next year, a series of tests at regular intervals along the whole coast - and, where possible, at places near factories where fishing is done - should be made as to the condition, etc., of fish so that reliable data could be available.

The present sanctuaries should also be kept under observation to ascertain to what extent, if any, they are meeting the object for which they were created.

This was agreed to.

(5) Land Sites for Fishing Stations.

Attention was drawn to the granting of sites for fishing stations by the Lands Department without apparently any regard to the interests of the fishing industry. It was resolved that the Provincial Secretary be asked to approach the Lands Department in the matter.

(6) Undersized Crawfish.

Mr Mansergh read a letter from Messrs Stent and Simpson, complaining, on behalf of the Salt River Canning Co., Table Mountain Co., Sun Co., Overstone, and North Bay Co., of the severity of Regulation No. 211 of 1914; and asking, in connection therewith, for the Magistrates to be invested with discretionary powers.

A reply had been framed which was now in the hands of the legal adviser, who thought it might be possible to frame a regulation which, whilst in no way lessening strong Government control as desired by the Board, would not unduly penalise canners. The legal adviser's recommendations, when received, would be submitted to the Board.

(7) Artificial Rearing of Crawfish.

Mr Mansergh considered the engagement of the services of an expert in the artificial rearing of fish would involve an ex iiture of about £1000. It was resolved to point out to the Pr. incial Secretary the need of such provision in the Estimates for the next financial year.

(8) Estimates.

Mr Irvin moved that the Estimates of the Board for the last two years be circulated among the Members. Agreed to.

(9) Next Meeting of the Board.

It was decided that the next Meeting of the Board be ab t the 4th January 1919.

J. W. Munnik,
SECRETARY.

ONFIRMED.

Lewis Mansergh
7 January 1919.
CHAIRMAN.

Minutes of Meeting of Fisheries Board held at Huguenot Buildings on the 7th January, 1919.

PRESENT : Mr. Mansergh (Chairman), Dr. Gilchrist, and Messrs Runciman, J. G. and A. H. Reid.

(1). Crawfish : Close season North of Baboon Point.

Mr. J.G. Reid read a letter from John Ovenstone Ltd., protesting against close season North of Baboon Point from 22nd December to 22nd April. Considered entirely wrong for Port Nolloth. Factory etc., just completed and considered no restrictions should apply first year. Expected to commence operations 1st February. Prepared to furnish Board with any data obtained during the year for proper determination of close season. Suggest appointment of Fishery Officer at Port Nolloth. Request cancellation of Proclamation re close season. Similar letters were addressed to Members of Board, and the Secretary.

Mr. Reid also read a letter from the Table Mountain Canning, Co., (Lindstrom) protesting against close season as affecting Lamberts Bay. Considered Mr. Reid representative of Canners on Fisheries Board and that he should have consulted Canners before recommending close season. Asked for alteration of close season so as to restart fishing on the 1st February.

Mr. Reid stated that he did not consider himself representative of the Canners. Any decisions he came to were only with the sincere desire to promote the good of the fishing industry as a whole.

Mr. Mansergh concurred. He read a letter from the Lamberts Bay Canning Co., (Lindstrom) somewhat similar to the one received by Mr. Reid from the Table Bay Canning Co. In belief that no restrictions would apply for first year a year's contract had been entered into with employees and, as fishing during winter months, part of May, whole of June and July, and part of August impossible, and in addition the open season only commencing 22nd April, the outlook for the firm was serious. Urged restarting of fishing on the 1st February.

A report by Dr. Gilchrist on experimental hauls at Lamberts Bay between 24th and 29th December, 1918, showed that the condition of fish in Lamberts Bay to be very similar to that found in Table Bay during the same season of the year. In both localities marked absence of males. None found in Table Bay and only nine in Lamberts Bay of which seven were in hard new shell and two in soft old shell. Males therefore casting shells. In both places females in fair abundance and in berry. Females therefore in condition to be protected. Eggs of females in Lamberts Bay more advanced than those in Table Bay. Close season for Lamberts Bay should therefore not be much different from that of No. 2 Area.

Mr. J.G. Reid considered that Dr. Gilchrist's report favoured his recommendations at previous meeting of Board of an uniform close season from 15th October to 14th February. This would prevent Canners in closed areas fishing in waters of open areas, and assure fish getting a rest. Such a close season should be firmly adhered to and only departed from on very good and valid reasons.

In reply to Mr. Mansergh, Dr. Gilchrist said he was in agreement with Mr. Reid subject to the proviso that results of experiments to be conducted further northwards be awaited. He hoped shortly to make experiments at Port Nolloth.

Mr. Runciman said that the essential factor of a close season was the four months rest : when it took place was immaterial. He moved that a Conference be arranged with all the Canning Companies to see whether they would agree to an uniform close season as suggested by Mr. Reid.

This was agreed to and Mr. Mansergh promised to call it as early as possible.

(2) Suggested

(2). Suggested Regulation re Control of Capture etc., of Crawfish.

Mr. Mansergh read the regulation suggested by Mr.Swift, Legal Adviser, which read as follows :—

"No person shall, at any time,fish for,capture,sell, expose for sale,or be in possession of for any purpose whatsoever :—

(a) Any Crayfish or Kreeft of a size less than four inches measured from the rostrum or middle anterior spine or beak to the end of the carapace, shield or shell,except for fishermen's bait ;

(b) Any female Crayfish or Kreeft in berry ;

and if while fishing any person shall capture any crayfish or Kreeft less than the size hereinbefore mentioned he shall as soon as possible return the same to the sea ;
Provided that any person charged with an offence against this regulation shall be discharged if he prove to the staisfaction of the Court that he has taken all steps reasonably practicable to comply with the terms thereof ;
Any person convicted of a contravention of this regulation shall be liable to a fine not exceeding £ 5. "

Mr. Swift added in his report :—

" I put the above forward as a suggestion for consideration. It seems to me that if the taking of these small fish into factories etc., is to be prevented there must be a system of compulsory sorting and inspection at the landing stage. "

Mr. Runciman did not consider that return to the sea "as soon as possible" would meet the case. He would prefer that emphasis should be laid on "Sorting in the fishing grounds".
Mr. J.G. Reid agreed.

On the motion of Mr. A.H. Reid it was decided to discuss the matter with the Canners at the proposed Conference.

(3). Estimates for 1919 - 20.

Mr. Runciman moved that the Board act as a Committee to frame Estimates for 1919-20. Agreed to.
Mr. Runciman was appointed Chairman and Convener of the said Committee.

J. W. Munnik.

SECRETARY.

CONFIRMED.

J G Reid

CHAIRMAN. 18/2/19

Minutes of Meeting between Fisheries Advisory Board and Representatives of Crawfish Canning Companies, held at the Huguenot Buildings on Tuesday, the 21st January, 1919.

PRESENT: Mr Mansergh (Chairman), Dr Gilchrist, and Messrs J.G. and A.H.Reid, and Runciman. Also Mr Treadwell.

Representatives of Crawfish Companies:- Capt. Scharmberg (Saldanha Canning Co.); Messrs R. Yuill and A. Boyes (Sun C.Co.); A. Lindstrom (Table Bay C. Co.); R. Ovenstone (J. Ovenstone Ltd.); R. Lord (Stephan Bros.); R. Hickson (Hickson & Sons); and A. Pritchard (Salt River C. Co.).

(1). CLOSE SEAON FOR CRAWFISH.

The Chairman explained that the meeting was called to consider two matters (1) the Close Seasons for Crawfish, and (2) the capture of Undersized Crawfish.

As regards the former, incessant trouble was experienced with the dates fixed for close season for each area. Each year there are complaints and applications are received for concessions, revision of dates, etc. No dates had been fixed for area North of Baboon Point but when the Magistrate reported the establishment of two canning factories within that area, the Board decided to bring that area into line with the other areas and accordingly recommended a close season from Baboon Point to Orange River from 22nd December, 1918, to 22nd April, 1919. A somewhat similar close season had existed in previous years. An appeal had been made against it by two firms who, in establishing their factories in that area, had unfortunately for themselves, taken no measures to ascertain whether there was any possibility of a close season being proclaimed.

In considering the appeal, the question of an uniform close season from 15th October to 14 February had been urged, and the Board thought that it would be best to arrange a meeting with the canners to hear their views on this point.

Mr LORD stated that his firm had two factories in No. 3 area. Their fishing periods were from 15th October to 15th December, and 15th April to 15th June. Bad weather and close season barred fishing at other times. An uniform close season as suggested would mean irretrievable disaster as it would leave them with only two months' fishing in the year.

Mr OVENSTONE agreed. In 1916, they fished in No. 3 area from last week in October to 24th November and found fish in excellent condition. He pointed out that there was a difference of 75 days in close seasons between Nos. 1 and 3 areas, a distance of 138 miles, whereas one time of close season had been adopted for No. 4 area, a distance of 279 miles. Was the Board convinced it was right? There were anomalies in the present close seasons for areas 1 to 3 but, as a whole, they were the most suitable yet devised and should not be disturbed. For instance, on 15th February last year crawfish in fine hard shell were found at Mouille Point but at Robben Island on the same day the crawfish were in soft shell.

Mr YUILL found the present close seasons for areas 1 to 3 satisfactory. Canners did not desire them to be disturbed.

The rest of the representatives were in agreement with these views.

Mr RUNCIMAN wished the canners to understand that the Board had no antagonistic feeling towards them. The Board was quite alive to their interests and simply desired to hear the views of the canners as to an uniform close season.

Mr LINDSTROM considered that a year's fishing should be allowed in No. 4 Area before enforcing a close season so that data could be collected. Suggested that the close season proclaimed for No. 4 Area be amended so that fishing could commence on the 15th February, 1919. His firm would be prepared to collect data and place them at the disposal of the Government. Also suggested

that

that the Government should send an officer to take townettings, etc. They would, if necessary be prepared to meet expenses of such an officer.

Dr GILCHRIST said that he had no decided view in regard to No. 4 Area. As regards Areas 1 to 3, the Canners were satisfied and it would be best 'to let well alone'.

The CHAIRMAN, on behalf of the Board, intimated that, in view of what had been said, the close seasons for Areas 1 to 3 would not be disturbed. No. 4 Area could be treated as a pioneer area and fishing allowed to be resumed on the 15th February next.

(2) CAPTURE OF UNDERSIZED CRAWFISH.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that two factors were concerned in the matter:- the canners, and the fishermen. Either canners must arrange a close inspection of fish at landing stage and reject all small fish, or fishermen must be compelled to sort the fish at sea and so relieve canners of first alternative. The Law Adviser had suggested that the present regulations be amended so that any person catching undersized crawfish "shall as soon as possible return the same to the sea".

Mr OVENSTONE did not think the suggested amendment would improve matters. The great difficulty was want of facilities for sorting at the Docks. The slipway is far too small to accommodate all the boats and when steamers were hauled up on the slipway boats had to come at night to unload: cartage had to be carried out quickly for if the fish were left over until the next day they would be useless for canning. The position would only improve when they had better accommodation at the Docks and proper sorting tables. There was no provision for sorting crawfish in the new harbour.

The CHAIRMAN wanted to know whether sales could not be regulated by fixing the price of fish per 100 lb instead of per 100 fish - the latter system being an inducement to catch small fish.

Mr OVENSTONE was dubious. If there were no large fish about, the small ones would be caught.

Mr LINDSTROM considered the remedy lay in the reduction of the size limit from 4" to 3¾". Fishermen contend that they could easily tell a 3¾" fish. They have always complained about the increase in size to 4" and a reduction now to 3¾" would be an inducement to sort more carefully than is now done. Messrs YUILL, PRITCHARD, and REID spoke in favour of such a reduction, which was apparently favoured by all the representatives present.

The CHAIRMAN considered the suggestion a very serious one. A reduction in size would lead to much greater consumption and imperil the industry. On the other hand, the difficulties arising in sorting crawfish would not disappear by reduction in the size limit to 3¾".

Mr HICKSON held that the case would be met by compelling every fishermen to take out a licence to fish and, if the regulations were violated, to cancel the licence.

Mr OVENSTONE agreed provided a percentage of undersized crawfish were allowed and a differentiation in such percentage were made between open and deck boats as the latter boats are better fitted out for sorting fish.

Dr GILCHRIST admitted that there are mature fish under 4". He was not however agreeable to any relaxation in this respect. It might lead to great damage and ultimately to the closing down of factories for a time.

At the suggestion of Mr OVENSTONE, it was decided to obtain the views of the FISHERMEN in the matter.

J. W. MUNNIK,
Secretary.

Confirmed.

Chairman.

J D Gilchrist 18/2/19

Minutes of Meeting between Fisheries Advisory Board and Representatives of the Italian Fishermen, held at the Huguenot Buildings on Tuesday, 4th February, 1919.

PRESENT: Mr Mansergh (Chairman), Dr Gilchrist, and Mr Irvin. Also Mr Treadwell.
Representatives of Italian Fishermen: Messrs O.Sangiorgo, A. Messina, A. Antuona, A. Puma, L. Asara, and G. Borruso.

CAPTURE OF UNDERSIZED CRAWFISH:

The CHAIRMAN stated that the meeting had been called to ascertain the views of the fishermen in regard to the possibility of sorting out all undersized crawfish caught on the fishing grounds. A suggestion had been made that a reduction of the size limit from 4" to 3¾" would greatly facilitate sorting on the grounds and considerably reduce the number of fish that have to be returned to the sea.

Messrs SANGIORGO and ASARA, who were the main speakers of the Italians, expressed the following views:-

Most of the fish caught are between 3½" and 4": of this the majority are between 3¾" and 4". Extremely difficult to sort fish on the fishing grounds. When weather conditions favourable, the fish are thrown on the deck, but this is not possible in bad weather. Fish that are obviously undersize are thrown back into the sea, but this cannot be done in respect of fish where there is doubt. Financial considerations would preclude such action. It would require an expert to make quick decisions - and such a person is not always available -, and when a big haul of fish is in progress there is not time for such delicate work. Did not consider there was any falling off of fish. The natural increase far exceeded the number caught. Nor was there a diminution in size. The same fish are caught nowadays at Oude Kraal as were found there 10 years ago. At Berg River, during the last three years a smaller size crawfish has been caught - shorter in head and stouter. If not a different species, then their growth must be affected by the temperature of the water. Small fish are found at Oude Kraal about March-April and during June-August at Robben Island. Females in berry were found at Oudekraal during July-August. The number of fishing boats had greatly increased but this had not affected the number of fish caught. No new grounds were being exploited. Nowadays, with better boats, it was possible to traverse the fishing grounds in one day, whereas in the old days it would require 2 or 3 days. Had no objection to the close season - during its operation the fish are usually unsuitable for canning. On the fishing grounds about 20% of the fish are returned to the sea as undersized. It was impossible however to sort out all undersized fish: of [redacted] brought to the landing stage. Of these, more than half would die. Throwing a live fish into the sea does not necessarily mean that it would live as the rough treatment in the boat would probably cause death. With regard to the suggestion

of

of some Canners that, if the size limit were reduced to $3\frac{3}{4}$", the capture of crawfish should be subject to the possession of a licence, which should be liable to cancellation if the number of undersized fish landed from a boat exceeded a certain percentage, agreed upon, of the total catch, it would not be feasible. The number of small fish caught varied considerably. Such a law would inevitably lead to the prosecution of all fishermen and their ultimate elimination. As soon as a boat is offloaded the undersized fish are put into baskets which are sunk under the water at the slipway, or they are taken out to sea. At the New Dosks it will be possible, owing to the cleanness of the water, to put the undersized fish over the side of the boat when sorting out. They strongly favoured a reduction of size limit to $3\frac{1}{2}$". This would save a large percentage of waste, and would considerably relieve the difficulties of sorting out. An allowance of two hours from the time of offloading would be ample for the return of all undersized fish to the sea.

The CHAIRMAN expressed the thanks of the Board for their attendance and the deputation then withdrew.

Mr IRVIN considered that before any decision was arrived at in the matter, steps should be taken to verify the assertions that had been made. This could be done by obtaining from the Canning Companies returns for several years shewing the quantity of ccawfish caught each year; and by a Government official accompanying the fishermen on several trips and checking the number of fish caught and their size - especially the assertion that the majority of fish caught are between $3\frac{3}{4}$" and 4" -, and recording the number of undersized fish thrown overboard at the fishing grounds and the number brought ashore.

This was agreed to.

J. W. Munnik,

Secretary.

CONFIRMED.

J D F Gilchrist

C H A I R M A N.

pro 18/2/19

MINUTES of Meeting of Sub-Committee of Fisheries Advisory Board, appointed to frame Estimates of Expenditure in regard to Fisheries for the year 1919-20, held at Huguenot Buildings on 11th February, 1919.

PRESENT: Messrs Runciman (Chairman), A.H. Reid, Irvin, & Stephan, and Dr Gilchrist.

ESTIMATES for 1919-20.

After full consideration of the matter, the Secretary was instructed to communicate with the Provincial Secretary as follows:-

"The Board, having been asked to consider and advise on the Estimates of Expenditure for 1919-20 for Fishery purposes, desire again to impress on His Honour the Administrator, and through him the Provincial Council, the urgent necessity of recognising the vast importance of the fishery resources of South Africa, and the immediate need of providing for their development.

The Board has, in the past, repeatedly submitted reports on the potentialities of the industry to the country and suggestions as to the measures required to be adopted for its development, particularly in a minute addressed to His Honour the Administrator on the 27th March, 1912. Previous to that, the Board submitted a minute to the Under Secretary for Agriculture in March, 1910; and Annual Reports for 1911 and 1913 - to all of which the Board desire to refer for the further consideration of the Administrator and the Provincial Council.

The aforesaid minutes and reports dealt fully with, in addition to other matters:-

(a) The potentialities of the Fisheries of South Africa as an industry affording employment and food supply, possibilities of export, and increased wealth of the country.

(b) The necessity for the establishment of a Department of Fisheries.

(c) The need of reliable statistics.

(d) Further Scientific Investigations.

(e) Fishery Survey for additional fishing grounds.

(f) Harbour Accommodation.

The Board desire to express their disappointment with the response to their suggestions, as beyond expressions of sympathy and approval and regret for the inability to provide the necessary funds, the only result has been a sum of £2300 on the Estimates, a sum obviously utterly inadequate for the purpose.

The Board desire to point out the marvellous and gratifying development which has taken place during the past few years throughout the Union in all other industries, namely:- Agriculture, Manufactures, Mining, and

Commerce

Commerce: the only industry which has remained comparatively stagnant, and which has great possibilities, is the Fishing Industry.

Having in mind the economic and industrial change throughout the World as the result of necessities realized by the Great War, the Board feel that every effort should be made to develop the natural resources of the country, of which the Fishing Industry has such great possibilities.

It is not enough to say that there are no funds, as vast sums are found for other branches of industry, and the Government derives a large revenue from rentals of Fishing Stations, which should be applied to the development of the Fishing Industry.

The Board consider that, at the very least, provision should be made in the Fisheries Vote for 1919-20 for the following:-

1. Marine Biologist and Fisheries Adviser	£250x
2. Jonker's Hoek Trout Hatchery:	
(a) Curator	450x
(b) Labourer	48x
(c) Working costs	225x
(d) Assistance for general supervision of stock rivers	300
(e) Travelling expenses under (d)	200
(f) Introduction of aquatic plants into trout rivers	50
(g) Restocking of rivers	100
3. Secretary, Fisheries Board	36
4. Inspectors and Inspection of Sea Fisheries:	
(a) 2 Fisheries Inspectors (Western Div.)	600
(b) 2 " " (Eastern Div.)	600
(c) Travelling expenses & hire of launches	900
5. Statistics	600
6. Crawfish and General Fishery Investigations	~~500~~
(a) Sanctuary Observers	500
(b) Expert for Hatching	1000
(c) Assistants for experimental hauls, etc	300
(d) Purchase of motor launch and running costs	1000
(e) Equipment (nets, bottles, instruments etc	200
(f) Temperature Observations	100
7. Aquaria and Museum.	
(a) Wages of Attendant	100
(b) Laboratory requirements	100
(c) Purchase of specimens	100
(d) Cost of working laboratory, etc.	100
(e) Additional storage accommodation	300
8. Introduction and Acclimatisation of herring, etc	750
9. Grant to Eastern Province Acclimatisation Society	350x
(x Last available particulars)	£9259.

The Board have made no provision for Marine Biological Survey as they understand that an arrangement - of which they have no details - has been come to between the two Coastal Provinces (the Cape and Natal) and the Union Government. This Survey, the Board consider to be of the utmost importance and should be proceeded with at once. The contribution from Cape Provincial Funds should be additional to the amounts above suggested.

The Board also wish to emphasize the need of proper supervision of rivers containing trout as not only is there loss of revenue through illegal fishing but wholesale poaching is doing irretrievable damage to trout.

Confirmed
J. D. Leitch
Chairman 18/2/19

J. W. MUNNIK,
SECRETARY.

331

Meeting of Fisheries Advisory Board held at the Huguenot Buildings on Tuesday, the 18th February, 1919.

PRESENT: Dr Gilchrist (Acting Chairman), and Messrs A. H. Reid, Runciman, and Stephan. Also Mr Treadwell.

(1) SUGGESTED REDUCTION IN SIZE LIMIT OF CRAWFISH:

Dr Gilchrist read a letter from Mr Irvin, who was absent from Town, strongly suggesting a reduction in the size limit to 3½" or 3¾".

Dr Gilchrist stated that, from a scientific point of view and having regard to the preservation of the fish, he could not favour any reduction in size limit.

Mr Treadwell submitted a report by Mr Mansergh dealing, inter alia, with local hauls of crawfish at Hout Bay and Table Bay. The figures were:-

(1) Hout Bay: (Private source)

No. of Crawfish brought in: 3402
No. under 4" 1862 i.e. 55% of total.
Of the 1862 undersized crawfish 80% was stated to be between 3¾ and 4 inches.

(2) Hout Bay: (Trial Haul).

Total catch of Crawfish: 466.
46% of total catch under 3½ inches.
61% " " " " 3¾ inches.
75% " " " " 4 inches.

(3) Table Bay: (Trial Haul) (Green Point).

Total catch of Crawfish: 537.
5% of total catch under 3½ inches.
12% " " " " 3¾ "
24% " " " " 4 "

(4) Oude Kraal: (Trial Haul).
Total catch of Crawfish: 44.
52% of total catch under 3½ inches.
68% " " " " 3¾ "
77% " " " " 4 "

"The larger proportion of fish between 3¾" and 4" shewn in the 1st statement above is therefore not borne out by the experimental hauls, but these experiments being very small the comparison is uncertain".

Mr STEPHAN considered that the present size limit secured the protection of the 2½" and 3" fish. A reduction to 3¾" or 3½" would mean the absorption in the general catch of a greater number of such fish. Conditions point to Cape Town being in for an extraordinary bad season. The catch was 50% less than usual. At Lambert's Bay, the crawfish were in great abundance and in excellent condition. The Crawfish caught are small to what they used to be. There was danger of the old grounds being fished out.

Dr

Dr Gilchrist agreed that the fish were getting smaller.

Mr A. H. REID moved that the 4" size limit be adhered to. Mr Stephan seconded.

AGREED TO.

(2) CAPTURE OF UNDERSIZED CRAWFISH AND THEIR RETURN TO THE BEA:

After discussion, it was decided to draw the attention of the Administrator to the tendency to a gradual diminution in the supply and size of Crawfish caught, which, if continued, will raise the serious question of the possible decimation of the fish.

Further, the Board is not prepared to suggest any alteration of the present regulation dealing with the capture of undersized crawfish. It considers however that a minimum penalty without an option, which should be fairly severe, should be provided for any infraction of that regulation; and that Magistrates should be empowered to confiscate fishing gear of, and to cancel the licence of any boat used by, an offender.

J. W. MUNNIK,

Secretary.

C O N F I R M E D.

Lewis Hancock

Chairman. 10. 7. 1919.

Minutes of Meetings of Fisheries Advisory Board held at the Huguenot Buildings on July 10th, 1919.

PRESENT; Mr.Mansergh (Chairman), Dr. Gilchrist and Messrs. Van Zyl, J. G. Reid, Stephan and Irvin. Also Mr. Treadwell.

(1) FISHERIES SURVEY.

Mr. Mansergh stated that provision for making survey had been met by a contribution of £3000 each from the Cape and Natal Provincial Administrations, and a ~~fourth~~ further contribution of £2000 by Messrs Irvin and Johnson on behalf of the Fishing Industry. Any excess expenditure beyond £8000 was to be met by the Department of Mines and Inddistries. Negotiations with Admiralty for the loan of the whaler, H.M.S.PICKLE, were nearly completed. The vessel was to be ensured as fully as possible, and complete indemnity given against any damage. Mr. Irvin and Dr. Gilchrist were appointed Honorary Directors to plan and carry out the survey work, subject to instructions from the contributing parties given through the Committee, who would be glad of suggestions from the various Fisheries Boards.

Mr.J.G.Reid pointed out the desirability of obtaining information as to whether crawfish are found in deep sea water, and, if so, whether they spawn in such water, and also their size and numbers.

This was endorsed by members, who suggested that the line of action to be pursued in such investigations should be determined by Dr. Gilchrist.

(2) CLOSE SEASON FOR CRAWFISH - No. 4AREA.

Dr. Gilchrist stated that the result of his investigations up to date disclosed no need for differentiation in close season between Areas 3 and 4 as the conditions are essentially the same.

Mr. J.G.Reid did not consider close season the best possible system, but some system of protection was necessary. Dates for close season are not altogether right. There is a difference of from 4 to 6 weeks between areas Nos. 1 and 3.

Mr. Stephan strongly objected to the close seasons. The present prohibited areas and a natural close season of 2½ months are quite sufficient protection. What was wanted was proper and effective control. The catch of fish during present season was phenomenal- with the close season more fish are caught owing to greater pressure under which the factories are worked. The period of sickness was more or less the same, but was subject to changes the nature of which was not understood. Dr. Gilchrist's data of last year were not in conformance with the experiences of Lindstrom who had to close down, and was only now commencing to fish again. He was astounded recently to hear that fish at Lambert's Bay were sick, while those at Paternoster etc. - 30 miles distant - were in prime condition.

Mr. Irvin moved that returns of crawfish caught be obtained from the Canners in No.4 area, namely, Messrs. Stephan Bros., Ovenstone Ltd., Lambert's Bay Canning Co., the North Bay Co., and also from fishermen and local owners of boats; and that their opinion be obtained as to the most suitable period for a four months' close season.

AGREED TO.

(3). NETTING IN BERG RIVER.

Mr. Mansergh explained that there ~~were~~ are two kinds of fishermen: (1) the Seine Netters and the Set Netters in the back waters or platen of the river. Originally in the Board's representations set nets were allowed at Flamink Vlei, Velddrift Flat and Zwaartjes Baai; to these on the representations of the netters and the recommendations of the local Magistrate, a fourth plaat had been

added.....

added - Kersboschdrift. The set netters however now contend that they cannot make a living, and apply for the platen known as De Sloopy, Schuintjesdrift and Zeekoe Island, or for a portion of the Berg River to be included in the sphere of their operations.

Mr. Stephan held that any concession in this direction was an incentive to pauperisation. He pointed out that most of the fishermen were away from the Berg River four months in the year "snoeking", and that, in addition, they were also employed at the crawfish factories.

Mr. Reid considered that help given in the direction applied for meant the making of more poor whites. He moved: "That the Board regret the inclusion of Kersboschdrift among the platen available for set or stake netting, and strongly opposes any further concessions

AGREED TO.

(4) Expert for the Artificial Hatching and Rearing of Crawfish.

Dr. Gilchrist pointed out that experiments in this direction have been in progress for some years. Crawfish have been reared to a stage fairly secure - when they rise to the surface. It was found however that harders and other fish destroyed them at this stage in great numbers. The time had come for the importation of a man who had devoted a lifetime to the hatching and rearing of lobsters. Information as to the cost, etc., should be obtained from America.

Mr. Mansergh wanted to know whether the services of an expert should be obtained to report on the position at the Cape.

Mr. van Zyl strongly objected, and was supported by Mr. Reid.

Mr. Reid pointed out that the Canners felt that they would probably be called upon to contribute to the cost of an expert, and would therefore like to know the probable cost entailed.

Dr. Gilchrist considered the expenditure would be probably £1000 per year. The expert should study the position and arrange for placing the hatching and rearing of crawfish on a commercial footing.

Mr. Irvin moved:-

"That the services of an expert to advise and establish the artificial hatching and rearing of crawfish be obtained for a period not less than two yeats at a cost estimated from £1500 to £2500; and that in view of the urgency of the matter, if the Government is not prepared to accept the whole cost of the undertaking, the Canners be asked to contribute on the £1 for £1 principle."

THIS WAS AGREED TO.

FISHING STATISTICS.

Mr. Mansergh submitted for information of Members a form received from the Director of Census dealing with the supply of fishing statistics to his Department under the following headings:-

(1) Boats licensed and value of boats and gear.

(2) Number and Race of persons employed.

(3) Quantity and value of catch.

(4) Quantity and value of more important kinds of fish caught.

DIMINUTION OF CRAWFISH.

Letter on the subject was read from Mr. Daneel.

Chairman

Secretary

335

Minutes of Meeting of Fisheries Advisory Board held at the Huguenot Buildings on Wednesday, the 22nd October, 1919.

Present: Mr.Weisbecker (Acting Chairman), Dr. Gilchrist, and Messrs. J.G.Reid and A.H.Reid and Irvin. Also Mr. Treadwell.

Mr. Weisbecker intimated that Mr. Mansergh was on leave and that during his absence he (Mr.Weisbecker) would temporarily occupy the chair.

(1) CLOSE SEASON FOR CRAWFISH IN NO.4 AREA - BABOON POINT TO NORTH OF THE ORANGE RIVER.

Mr. J.G.Reid stated that fishermen in No.4 area whom he had interviewed desired a close season from March to June. There was diversity of opinion as to what should be the ~~xxxxxxxx~~ proper time. The main point was that if it is necessary to have a close season for Area No.3 there should also be one for No. 4.

Dr. Gilchrist stated that investigations showed that the conditions in No.4 area are the same as those in No. 3 area. One close season would therefore do for these areas.

Mr. Irvin suggested that the canners be advised that the close season in No.4 be the same as in No. 3 area unless they agree on some other period.

Mr. Weisbecker considered the suggestion unsatisfactory. The Administration should get a definite resolution from the Board - if necessary further investigations could be made - and should not have to appeal to the canners.

The Secretary pointed out that at the conclusion of the meeting with the canners in January last, the Chairman stated that No. 4 area would be treated as a pioneer area and fishing allowed to be resumed on the 15th February, 1919, but no promise was made to keep the area open.

Dr. Gilchrist moved and Mr.A.H.Reid seconded that the close season for No. 4 be the same as that for No.3 area. AGREED TO.

(2) CRAYFISH SANCTUARIES.

The Chairman pointed out that beacons erected to define No. 1 sanctuary at Llandudno Bay were reported not be be observable from the sea.

An estimate for the erection of beacons for sanctuaries Nos 3 and 6 came to £85.

In view of this large expenditure, the Marine Biological Adviser was asked to report as to whether it should be definitely established that the areas in question are still the habitat of crayfish, and that their continuation as sanctuaries is fulfilling the purpose for which they were erected.

Dr. Gilchrist's report has been circulated, and, in view thereof, the Board is asked to state:-

(a) whether the existing sanctuaries are to be continued;

(b) if not, what sanctuaries, if any, does it recommend;

(c) how they should be defined; and

(d) what method of supervision is recommended, bearing in mind the cost of such supervision and the fact that no revenue is derived from the Crayfish industry.

Dr. .....

Dr. Gilchrist held that the sanctuaries were not fulfilling their object; they should be either enlarged considerably or abolished altogether.

Mr.J.G.Reid did not agree withthe remarks in the report regarding No.3 sanctuary (Bok Bay). He instanced cases of excellent hauls of crawfish.

Mr.A.H.Reid considered that the difficulty was effective control which required expenditure.

Mr. Weisbecker stated that the expenditure in fishing matters exceeded the revenue by £1000. Increased expenditure could not be incurred for the next six months.

Mr. Irvin moved that "the extension of the sanctuaries is desirable, but that its consideration stand over until funds are available to arrange for effective supervision and control." AGREED TO.

(3) MARINE SURVEY.

Mr. Weisbecker stated the Union Government had been requested to enter into a contract with the Admiralty for the use of H.M.S. "Pickle" for survey work. The services of a scientific officer were being secured. The boat will spend six months in Natal waters and six months in Cape waters in survey work.

(4) LEASE OF FISHING SITES.

Mr. Weisbecker read a letter from Major van Zyl with enclosure from Lands Dept. relative to fishing and other sites, issued by the Union Government. Major van Zyl added that if the Board wanted him to oppose in Parliament the issue of any further fishing sites, it should pass a resolution to that effect.

Mr. Weisbecker added that if the Board objected to the leasing of fishing sites, it must give adequate reasons for its opposition. The question arose as to whether it would not be better to leave the matter over until an amended Fisheries Ordinance was under discussion.

Dr. Gilchrist raised the question as to whether the revenue at present obtained by the Union Dept. in the leasing of such sites could not be diverted to the coffers of the Provincial Administration.

Mr.A.H.Reid moved that the correspondence be recorded.

AGREED TO.

(5) MOSSEL BAY: Prohibition of Netting in Little Brak River and Klein Doorn River.

Mr. Weisbecker stated that the Mossel Bay Angling Association and the Divisional Council had applied for an extension of the period of prohibition for a further period of three years. AGREED TO.

(6) MEETINGS OF BOARD.

It was agreed to hold meetings in future on the first Thursday in each month at 2.30 p.m.

(7) TRAWLING IN PLETTENBERG BAY.

A letter was read from the Magistrate, submitting a petition

against.....

against trawling within three miles from the shore at Plettenberg.

It was decided that the Magistrate be asked to report (1) how often trawling takes place in the Bay; (2) how far from the land trawling usually takes place; (3) when trawlers last appeared in the Bay and (4) the names of the owners of the trawlers.

(8) APPLICATION FOR FISHING SITES AT BERG RIVER MOUTH.

An objection from Mr. Braude was read. The application was passed.

(9) REGULATIONS RE INLAND FISHING.

A letter was read from the Magistrate, Mt. Ayliff, drawing attention to the words "trout and other non-indigenous fish" in Proclamation 14 of 1916.

As the words, "or other non-indigenous fish" were unnecessary, the Board agreed to their elimination.

Mr.A.H.Reid drew attention to the reference in the regulations to the use of a fly of a certain size for the catching of trout. The regulations did not state what kind of a fly should be used, with the result that instead of the bona-fide feather fly, illegal baits were used and advertised for sale.

(10) NEW FISHERIES ORDINANCE.

Mr. Weisbecker intimated that the Administrator considered that a revenue of £25000 should be obtained from the fisheries.

With this object in view, and to secure more effective control of the industry, it was proposed to pass a new Fisheries Ordinance. Copies of the Natal Fisheries Ordinance, which could be used as a basis for drawing up a new Ordinance Ordinance are being obtained as well as copies of all regulations issued thereunder. When these are obtained, members of the Board will be furnished with the copies and also with copies of the Cape Ordinance and regulations issued thereunder; and it is hoped that consideration thereof will result in the submission to the Administrator of definite recommendations for a comprehensive Fisheries Bill for consideration at the next session of the Provincial Council.

Mr. Weisbecker promised to obtain a return of all revenue and expenditure - Union, Cape and Natal - in connection with Fisheries; and to ascertain whether revenue, derived from leasing of land sites for fishing purposes in Natal, went to the Union or Natal Provincial Exchequer.

(11) EXPECTATION OF HERRING OVA.

Mr.A.H.Reid inquired as to the position in regard to the importation of Herring Ova.

Mr. Weisbecker promised to look into the matter.

4/12/19

J. W. MUNNIK.

Secretary.

Meeting of Fisheries Advisory Board held at Huguenot Buildings on Thursday, 4th December, 1919.
Present: Mr. Weisbecker (Chairman), Dr. Gilchrist and Messrs. Runciman, A.H.Reid, G.J.Reid, van Zyl and Stephan. Also Mr. Robson.

(1) CLOSE SEASON FOR CRAWFISH - No. 4 AREA.

The Chairman read protests against the provisions of Proclamation No.282 of 1919 making a close season for crawfish from 16th December to 15th April from Baboon Point to the north of the Orange River.

(1) John Ovenstone Ltd (Port Elizabeth)and Cape Town): Close season will impose serious handicap on factories. Experience demonstrates fish do not require protection for period mentioned. Official test by Magistrate, Springbokfontein, showed fish in good condition on 24th September, 1918. Area 4 should be so divided as to create new area for Port Nolloth Coast line along which close season should be from 1st March to 30th June.
(2) Lambert's Bay Canning Co., and (3) Stephan, Lord and Co: submitted returns showing months prohibited are the best time of the year; closed season proclaimed will compel closing of their factories entirely. Will severely affect fishermen who upon promise of constant work have settled at Lambert's Bay with their families. Suggested close season from 15th April to 15th August.
All complainants asked for permission to submit their representations to Board in person.
Also protest from number of fishermen employed by latter two firms. Have settled with their families at Lambert's Bay and invested savings of a lifetime in the purchase of boats. Proclaimed close season will force them to leave Lambert's Bay. Suggested close season from 15th April to 15th August when they could catch snoek. Declared fish from December to April in good condition.
Mr. Weisbecker stated that representatives from these firms had previously met him and suggested two close seasons for area No.4: (1) Baboon Point to 2o miles north of Lambert's Bay from 14th May to 14th August, and (2) from 20 miles north of Lambert's Bay to North Bank of Orange River from 1st March to 30th June.
Dr. Gilchrist pointed out that the principle of the close season was based on the protection of the male when they cast their shells, i.e., during the summer time. The suggestions for close seasons for Area No.4 appear to be based on the protection of the female, i.e during the winter months. Acceptance would mean the catching of crawfish during practically the whole of the year. The Board had always been firm on a four months close season. Its object would be defeated if the close season extended throughout the year. If the canners are barred in one area they would fish in another, and the crawfish would get no rest. Personally he favoured the protection of the female, but its adoption would mean the reversal of the policy hitherto pursued.
Mr. Stephan complained that the season for Areas 1 to 3 was arrived at after years of discussion and many interviews with canners. Different treatment has been meted out to Area No.4, where close season was decided upon after some experiments by Dr.Gilchrist during a short period of time. It was not fair to the canners in that area. He moved a close season from 15th April to 15th August from Baboon Point to 20 miles north of Lambert's Bay. He was not sufficiently acquainted with the conditions at Port Nolloth to make any recommendation covering that area. No seconder.
Mr. van Zyl moved that there be one close season of four months for the whole coast, and that the canners from the different areas be asked to meet within a month and decide as to the most suitable time. If they are unable to come to a decision the Board would give a decision. Mr. Runciman seconded.
Dr.Gilchrist suggested that the motion be amended so as to allow different close seasons of four months each for the different areas but that there should be no marked overlapping.
Mr. Stephan suggested that the canners of each area decide as to the best time for a close season within their areas and that they should be restricted to fishing within their areas.
Mr. Weisbecker doubted whether such restriction could be enforced under the law as it stood. In addition there were other practical objections, i.e. proper supervision to enforce such a regulation.
Mr. van Zyl's motion was lost by 4 to 3
Mr A.H.Reid moved that Dr.Gilchrist meet the canners and af

"Minutes" Book
Fishery Advisory Bd
from Nov. 1943

consultation with them submit recommendations as to the periods which would be most suitable as close seasons. No seconder.

Mr.Stephan suggested that Dr.Gilchrist should visit No.4 area as soon as ~~xxxxxxx~~ the close season commenced and make personal investigations, the results of which should be binding on the Board.

Mr. van Zyl moved that "As the evidence of the fishermen an Dr.Gilchrist differs, we regret that we are not in a position to recommend any change and decide to bring to the notice of the Administrator the fact that unless assistance be given without delay to Dr. Gilchrist to make experimental ~~xx~~atches between Cape Point and Orange River so that official data could be available on which to base our opinions, we feel that we cannot carry on our work with satisfaction to the industry or to ourselves." Seconded by Mr. Runciman. AGREED TO.

(2) TRAWLING IN PLETTENBERG BAY.

The Chairman intimated that in accordance with the request the Board the local Resident Magistrate had been communicated with & had now reported (1) a trawler has been in the habit of entering the Bay to within about a mile from the shore fortnightly and remaining there for a few days. (2) Its last appearance was about the middle of October. (3) Names of owners are not known, but one trawler is from one/ East and/from Cape Town, and (4) There is generally only one trawler but in October another trawler entered the Bay.

Attention was drawn to a suggestion of the Board last year that owners of trawlers should be asked to state whether there was any objection to the prohibition of trawling within three miles from any part of the coast of the Cape Province.

The Chairman promised to look up the correspondence.

(3) INTRODUCTION OF HERRING OVA.

Mr. Runciman stated that the freight conditions were such as to make it utterly impracticable to secure a consignment of ova at the present time.

It was decided to postpone action temporarily.

(4) PROPOSED HARVESTING OF SEAWEED.

The Chairman stated that an application had been received from a Capt.E.T.Olufsen inquiring whether any licence was required to harvest seaweed for experimental purposes, and if so, whether an exclusive licence could be granted to him for certain well-defined areas. In this event information was required as to the basis on which the licence would be granted. The Chairman intimated that a reply had been sent that the Administration could not consider the matter as it would be detrimental to the interests of the Crawfish industry. The applicant had now offered to disclose the particular areas concerned which were not in touch with the crawfish areas.

The Board was not prepared to recommend the issue of a licence in terms of the application.

(5) PROPOSED NEW FISHERIES ORDINANCE.

Mr. Weisbecker suggested that the Board should discuss the Natal Ordinance section by section, after which a draft Ordinance would be prepared and resubmitted for the final consideration of the Board.

He pointed out that the present Cape Ordinance limited control to fishing operations, whereas the Natal Ordinance included Fishing Industries. More extensive control was required. In the Cape £6000 are being expended this year in obtaining Fishing Statistics, but in Natal all fishermen were licensed and a condition of the licence was a return of all fish caught. - Failure to do so meant withdrawal of licence.

Mr. Runciman referred to a visit of his to Grimsby during his recent stay in England. He had been much struck by the

excellent...

excellent results obtained there by the advances to fishermen to purchase boats. He also dwelt on the need of regulating the carting of fish, which was often done under disgraceful conditions.

It was decided to meet again on Wednesday, the 10th December at 2.30 p.m. (at the Huguenot Buildings) to discuss the Natal Ordinance on the lines of the Chairman's suggestion.

J. O. Munnik
Secretary

Confirmed
Weisbeck
Chairman
10 Dec 1919.

Minutes of Meeting of Fisheries Advisory Board held on Wednesday the 10th December, 1919.

Present: Mr. Weisbecker (Chairman), Dr. Gilchrist and Messrs. Runciman and J.G.Reid. Also Mr.Robson.

Communications of regret at not being able to be present were received from Messrs.A.H.Reid and Stephan.

(1) TRAWLING IN PLETTENBERG BAY.

The Chairman read replies received from the following firms on the question of prohibiting trawling within three miles of the coast.

(1) S.A.Fisheries Co., Mossel Bay: Objected to prohibition.

(2) Messina Bros: usually fished beyond 3 mile limit

(3) Irvin & Johnson: If 3 mile prohibition to follow undulations of coast no objection to its application in western waters except in False Bay. In Eastern waters fishing grounds small and far apart. Trawling in some places compelled to take place within 3 miles from coast.

Dr.Gilchrist did not consider that as regards Plettenberg Bay/ should be prohibited as asked for by fishermen. Mr.Reid seconded. Agreed to.

(2) CLOSE SEASONS FOR CRAYFISH.

The Chairman stated that as the Administrator depended for his advice on the Board, and as the Board had not recommended any change in the close season as laid down for Area No.4. the petitioners for an alteration in the close season for that area had been advised that the Administrator was not prepared to withdraw the Proclamation now in force.

He read a recommendation from Dr.Gilchrist that there should be a continuous close season for four months in each of the four areas, but that such close seasons should not unduly overlap, and that with this proviso the canners should be asked to suggest the periods during which the close season should apply to their particular area.

He desired the views of the members on the suggestion which it seemed to him would if given effect to, override the functions of the Board. He added that the Administrator had agreed to meet a deputation from the petitioners above referred to in the course of a few days, and would therefore like to have a definite expression of opinion.

Mr. Reid mentioned that he had received advices that fish in soft shell had been caught on 29th November at Lambert's Bay and Donkin Bay. The crayfish season was therefore practically over in that region.

After further discussion the Board reaffirmed the decision arrived at at its last meeting.

Mr. Reid offered to provide a boat and bait free of charge for anyone appointed by Dr.Gilchrist to carry on experimental work in any part of No.4 area. The Chairman thanked him for the offer, and promised that it would be borne in mind.

Mr. Runciman expressed the hope that something would be done to watch developments in areas 3 and 4.

(3) FISHERY STATISTICS.

Arising out of the discussion of the proposed new Fishery Ordinance, the Board decided to recommend to the Administrator that the collection of fishery statistics as at present in vogue and the expenditure of funds thereon be suspended until a more adequate system be devised.

(4) LEASING OF CROWN LAND FOR FISHERY AND SEALING PURPOSES. NATAL.

In replies to enquiries on the above subject addressed to the Natal Provincial Administration, the Chairman stated that.....

that a communication had been received from the Surveyor-General, Natal, to the effect that a site in the Admiralty Reserve had been let to the Grindrost Whaling Co. for whaling on a five years' lease, commencing from 1st November, 1908, and had been extended for a further period from 1st November 1918. The rent for the site is paid into Union Revenue.

(5) PROPOSED NEW CAPE FISHERIES ORDINANCE.

The Natal Fisheries Ordinance was discussed clause by clause and subjected to numerous additions, deletions and amendments. The Chairman promised to have a draft Ordinance prepared in terms of the recommendations, and to submit it for the consideration of Members.

J. W. MUNNIK.

Secretary.

Confirmed.

Chairman.

Minutes of Meeting of Fisheries Advisory Board held at the Huguenot Buildings on Friday, the 5th March, 1920.

Present: Mr. Mansergh (Chairman), Dr. Gilchrist, and Messrs. Runciman, Irvin, Stephan, A.H.Reid and Rawbone. Also Mr. Treadwell.

Mr. Mansergh extended a very cordial welcome to Mr. J.Rawbone, M.P.C., who made his first appearance as a Member of the Board.

In connection with the nomination of Members of the Board up to 30th June, 1920, he explained that it is hoped by that time to have the proposed Fisheries Ordinance on the Statute Book, when it is hoped to make a fresh start.

DRAFT ORDINANCE TO CONSOLIDATE AND AMEND THE FISHERIES ORDINANCE

Consideration of the Draft Ordinance led to the following amendments:-

(1)b After "shell fish" (final line) add "whales or other aquatic fish."
1.(d) After "fishing for" add "sale or".
1.(e) Delete "the Imperial"; substitute "all" for "steam"; add "registered" after "gross"; and delete "and for others the registered tonnage."
1.(f) After "factory" add "Vessel".
1.(h) After "to take" (second line) add "for sale or profit".
4. (additional sub-section). The appointment of officers to supervise the grading and branding of all fish(including tinned and preserved) intended for exportation.
5.(b) and 6.(b) After "first" add "fish food and spawn".
14. Substitute for all words after "fish for" (last line) the words "scientific purposes or for the purpose of stocking other rivers."
16. After "fish" (last line) add "fish food and spawn."

The following recommendations were also carried:-

(1) Provisions for the control and inspection of fish intended for sale and stored, or otherwise dealt with in shops or private houses; or conveyed in fish carts, under disgraceful and insanitary conditions.

(2) Provisions similar to that existing under the Game Laws so as to exclude (under Section 13) the servants of a household from the right of catching fish.

(3) Provisions under Section 25 for power to refuse a licence to anyone who has been twice convicted of an offence under the Ordinance.

In conclusion, the Secretary was instructed to express the Board's appreciation of the very able manner in which the Draft Ordinance had been framed, and to ask the Hon. the Administrator to submit for its consideration a statement of all licensing fees which it is proposed to bring into operation under the Ordinance.

J. W. MUNNIK.

Secretary.

Confirmed

Lewis Mansergh

Chairman.

26.9.20.

Minutes of Fisheries Advisory Board, held at the Huguenot Buildings on the 6th March, 1920.

Present: Mr. Mansergh (Chairman) and Messrs. Runciman, Rawbone, and A. H. Reid, also Messrs. Day, J. P. Brunt and Treadwell.

Mr. Mansergh explainedthe tariff of licence duties which it is proposed to introduce in connection with the proposed new Fisheries Ordinance.

Mr. Runciman claimed that a tax of £5 per year on trawl nets ~~too~~ was too severe. Trawlers usually carried spare trawl nets, which might not be used for years, and it was manifestly unfair to levy any tax on such nets. He considered that if an additional levy was necessary it should be made on the trawler. This view was supported by the other Members present.

In regard to the proposal to levy a 2½% tax on the profits of Whaling and Fishing Companies, and a tax of ½d. per half lb. on the tinned products of Canning Companies, the Board expressed the opinion that whatever method of taxation is decided upon it should be applicable to all companies.

J. W. MUNNIK.

Secretary.

Chairman.

Minutes of Meeting of Fisheries Advisory Board. held on the 28th September, 1920.
Present: Mr. Mansergh (Chairman), Dr. Gilchrist, and Messrs. Runciman, A.H. and J.G.Reid, Van Zyl and Stephan. Also Mr. Aling. Rawbone

The Minutes of the previous meeting were confirmed.

(1) Inadequate Accommodation for Crawfish Boats in Docks.
Mr. Aling read correspondence indicating that the matter first came under consideration in 1916. The Railway Department promised increased accommodation, but up to the present has not been able to do anything owing to the considerable expenditure involved.

(2) Close Seasons for Crawfish from (a) Baboon Point to a point 20 miles south of Port Nolloth and (b) 20 miles south of Port Nolloth to the North Bank of the Orange River.
The point which came up for consideration was whether the dates previously tentatively in operation for the close season in the above areas, viz: (a) 15th April to 14th August and (b) 1st March to 30th June, should be further continued or whether they should be altered.
Mr.J.G.Reid did not consider that there was much variation in seasons from Duiker Point to Baboon Point. He favoured one close season for the whole coast.
Mr. Stephan strongly opposed. Such a step would ~~mm~~ inevitably penalize some of the canners. Preferred the abolition of close seasons and the erection of sanctuaries. If this is not possible, would prefer the present close season to continue despite the overlapping that exists with this addition that no canners should be allowed to can fish when his area is closed. He felt convinced that canners would be willing to agree to such an undertaking. It would obviate the need of police patrol, etc.
In reply to a question Mr. Mansergh stated that now that more money was available it was proposed to divide the coast into sections for purposes of ~~imp~~ inspection and to appoint an ~~inspection~~ inspector for each section.
Dr. Gilchrist held that scientific investigations pointed to the fact that the close season should be more or less the same for the whole coast. It must, however, be remembered that variations ensue owing to weather conditions. The principle underlying the present close seasons is the protection of the male (when casting its shell in the summer time). He would prefer the protection of the female in winter time, when it was in berry.
Mr.A.H.Reid pointed out that the female already enjoys legal protection during this period.
Mr. Runciman suggested the closing of the factories one year in every three or four years. This would ensure adequate protection.
It was however contended that this would lead to unemployment and create distress among the people now employed at the factories. It would also in other ways seriously affect the industry.
After discussing the principle of a uniform close season for the whole coast from Duiker Point to Orange River the dates to be based either upon those now in vogue which were adopted after the experience gained in the Southern areas (Nos. 1, 2, and 3) or upon such other data as might be forthcoming, Mr. van Zyl moved and Mr. G.J.Reid seconded

> "that after April next a uniform close season of four consecutive months be imposed along the whole of the Western Coast of the Province, and that the Canners be consulted as to the most suitable period."

The voting resulted in six for and one against. The motion was accordingly agreed to.

(3) Netting off Robben Island.
A letter was read from Mr. Daneel, who claimed that Geelbek passed ~~ak~~ along the East Coast of Robben Island on their way into

Table Bay, and that the scarcity of this kind of fish was due to the setting of nets between Robben Island and the mainland. Such netting should be prohibited.

Dr. Gilchrist considered that if nets were set right across the stretch of water between the island and the mainland such a contingency was possible, but a regulation which was once in force and is to be reenacted did not permit an uninterrupted stretch of netting. This would allow a passage for the fish to enter Table Bay. Geelbek was really a warm water fish and was therefore more abundant in the waters eastward; they were somewhat erratic in behaviour when they came into the cold water off the Western Coast.

In view of the regulation above mentioned, it was decided to take no further action.

(4) Netting in Table Bay.

Mr. Mansergh explained that representations had been made by Italian Consul for permission for Italian fishermen to fish with deep sea nets within the half mile protected area in Table Bay. In respect to one portion of this area adjacent to the Dock entrance, the Harbour authorities were unable to accede to the application. In respect to the use of the Italian Deep Sea net within the limits now protected by the half mile reserve along the shores of the Bay, the contest between the Italian fishermen and the Cape Town net fishermen which had with considerable difficulty been settled some years ago by the establishment of the Reserve.

present proposal would probably revive

Mr. van Zyl felt that care ~~should~~ should be exercised in respect of a matter which would affect the means of livelihood of a section of the community who had long been established, and ~~most~~ pobably not ~~be~~ were in a position to adopt any other avocation.

Dr. Gilchrist did not consider that the fish would be scared if the request of Italians were met. It would certainly increase the food supply, but it must be borne in mind that it would most likely deprive a section of the coloured fishing community of their means of a livelihood.

~~Mr. van Zyl moved that the half mile protected area in Table Bay be not disturbed, and this was agreed to.~~

It did not appear that there was satisfactory evidence in support of the view that by ~~acceding~~ acceding to the desire of the Italian fishermen material improvement in the supply of fish to Cape Town would be secured, and as the granting of the request might result in hardship to the Cape fishermen and give rise to friction and dissatisfaction without adequate compensating benefit, Mr. van Zyl moved that the half mile protected area in Table Bay be not disturbed, and this was agreed to.

Mr. Mansergh desired the Board's opinion as to the use by the Italians of a deep sea Seine net, a diagram of which had been circulated among the Members. He had refrained from giving an expression of opinion as to the desirability of a net of the dimensions shewn until the Board had considered the matter.

In the discussion which followed none of the Members saw any objection to the use of the particular net in question, which it was stated owing to its depth could only be used in deep water. It was pointed out that no legal objection existed at the present to the use of a net of these dimensions. In the circumstances it was decided that no decision for or against the adoption of this type of net should be given at present.

The Meeting then adjourned to Tuesday, the 5th October, 1920.

J.W.MUNNIK.

Secretary.

Conf'rmed.

Chairman.

5.10.20.

Meeting
Minutes of the Fisheries Advisory Board, held on the 5th October, 1920.

Present: Mr. Mansergh (Chairman), and Messrs. Runciman, ~~Rxxdxxx~~ J.G. Reid, Van Zyl, and Stephan. Also Mr. Aling.

The Minutes of the previous meeting were confirmed.

(1) Close Season for Crawfish.

Arising out of the resolution of the Board at its last meeting that after April next a uniform close season of four consecutive months should be imposed for the whole of the western coast of the Province, Mr.J.G.Reid pointed out that the present regulations aim at the protection of the male while it was casting its shell. During this period the male was afraid of its natural enemies and went into seclusion so that as it could not be caught it was thus amply protected. During the months of May and June, however, great damage was done to female crawfish in berry, which are then particularly voracious. He doubted whether females in an advanced stage of berry, when returned to the sea after ~~xxxxxxx~~ capture, would recover from the rough handling they received. He had discussed the position with some of the more intelligent fishermen and their views were in accord with his own that the most suitable period for a uniform close season was from 15th May to 14th September. If such a close season were proclaimed from May next the result would be a total close season of eight months during the ensuxing 12 months unless the present close seasons were repealed.

In the circumstances Mr. van Zyl moved that:-

" as a uniform close season of four months has already been agreed upon, (vide resolution of Meeting of 28th September 1920) immediate steps should be taken to acquaint the Canning companies with the decision arrived at, and to obtain their views as to the suggestion that such close season be from 15th May to ~~xxxx~~ 14th September each year."

Mr. Stephan seconded. The motion was agreed to.

(2) Netting in False Bay.

Mr. Mansergh explained that the conditions in regard to seine net fishing at False Bay were peculiar in that they were affected by local customs in vogue for a considerable time, by Magisterial decisions and by decisions of Higher courts.

In view of recent representations by Mr. ~~Van Zyl~~ Breda who had been unsuccessful in a case brought by him before the R. M. Court at Simonstown in regard to seine net fishing, a meeting between the Magistrate of Simonstown and Mr. Runciman at which Mr. Aling was present took place in order to hear the views of the parties interested in seine net fishing in False Bay.

As a result of that meeting, it was proposed that the present regulation, which reads as follows:-

"It shall not be lawful for any person or persons to divert the course of xx or "keer" any school of mullet (harder) by means of splashing or other method to the detriment of seine net fishing within the territorial waters of the Cape Colony."

should be superseded by the following:-

"It shall not be lawful for any person or persons to divert the course of or "keer" any school of fish by means of splashing or other action tending to divert or deflect such school of fish from the course which they are then naturally following towards the shore, neither shall it be lawful for any person when any school of fish has once passed a Seine Net Fishing ground to pursue or chase such school between the foreshore and the course which such school is travelling."

He felt very diffident in putting forward such a regulation for, apart from legal considerations and the effects of "Custom," he considered that the words "towards the shore" inthe proposed regulation made its interpretation far more restrictive than the one now in operation.

Mr. Runciman pointed out that the fish came from Hangklip direction towards Roman Rock Lighthouse and then moved towards the shore. ~~[illegible]~~ The agreement between the fishermen is that the fish should be attacked from the seawardx side so as to drive them towards the shore. Recently however, certain fishermen - in order to be first in the attack - had violated this agreement by getting in between the fish and the shore so that the fish had been scared and had put out to sea. The words "towards the shore" were essential as the Magisterial interpretation of the present regulation is not opposed to the practice above complained of.

Mr. J.G.Reid and Stephan concurred.

Mr. Mansergh inclined to the view that if the proposed regulation be adopted it would be first desirable to go carefully into the past history of the position at False Bay and to ascertain what difficulties, if any, might exist in the way of a regulation as proposed.

Mr. van Zyl questioned the wisdom of superseding the present regulation by one more restrive in its terms. It was a fallacy to accept a Magistrate's decision as final. He suggestedthat a civil case should be brought under the present regulation if possible, and if the Magistrate's verdict was not in accord with the Departmental interpretation, the matter should be carried to the Supreme Court for decision. He moved that the opinion of the Law Adviser be obtained as to whether the amending regulation does not restrict the original, and that the matter be resubmitted to the Board.

This was agreed to.

(3) Netting in Berg River.

Mr. Mansergh reported that on account of a recent decision of the Periodical Court at Roode Bay, "De Slopie" in the Berg River had been declared to be a "Plaat" or "Shallow" in terms of Government Notice No. 160 of 1912.

(4) Fishing Leases.

Arising out of a discussion on netting in rivers and the destruction therefrom of immature fish, the question of fishing leases came under review.

Mr. Mansergh referred to the necessity of a definition as to what is meant by a "fishing lease". The meaning of the term appeared to be somewhat vague and certain varieties of leases were granted under this designation. Mr. van Zyl contended that the Land Department should give out land purely as land and not as fishing sites. The latter was a matter which should be dealt with by the Board. He had made representations on the Select Committee, and if dates were supplied he now proposed taking further action as a Member of the House of Assembly. He hoped it would be possible to obtain all available information on the subject for consideration by the Board in time to allow him to bring the matter to the notice of the Select Committee at the next Session of Parliament.

Mr. Mansergh promised to obtain for the consideration of the Board at a later date a copy of the condition of fishing leases, and information as to the difference kinds of leases in force and their positionsx, with any other particulars germane to the matter.

(5) Fisheries Regulations: Sub-Committee.

Mr. Van Zyl moved the appointment of two sub-Committees to examine carefully the proposed regulations in regard to (a) Tidal Waters, and (b) Inland Waters and their applicability to present conditions: these Committees thereafter to submit their reports to a full meeting of the Board.

This was agreed to.

It was decided that the sub-committees be constituted as follows:-

(a) Tidal Waters: Messrs.Mansergh, Runciman and Irvin.

(b) Inland Waters: Messrs. Mansergh and A.H.Reid.

(6) Trek Ground - Brittania Point.

Mr. Stephan called special attention to the need of enlarging the trek ground area between Brittania Point and Shell Point(referred to on page 8 of the typed regulations) so as to extend from St. Martin's Point to Stumpnose Point. The matter was noted for special attention when the report of the Sub-Committee on the Regulations came up for treatment.

J. W. MUNNIK.

Secretary.

Confirmed.

Chairman.

12.10.20.

Frcon Conning Co

R. W. Hickson

F. Ovenstone Ltd

[illegible] Stephen Bros Ltd

G. Brandwein Ltd

J. G. Reed
N.B. C. Co Ltd

Sun Canning Co Ltd
Robt. B. Boyers

Geo Revill
Hoal Bay Canning Co (1920) Ltd

Arthur H. Reid

Minutes of Meeting between representatives of Canning Companies and Members of the Fisheries Advisory Board, held on the 12th October, 1920.

Present: Mr. Mansergh (Chairman), Dr.Gilchrist and Messrs. Stephan, van Zyl and J.G. and A.H.Reid. Also Mr. Aling.

CANNING COMPANY REPRESENTATIVES. African Canning Co., R.W. Hickson, J.Ovenstone Ltd., Sun Canning Co., (P.B.Boyes), Hout Bay Canning Co., (G.Revill). Mr. Stephan represented Stephan Bros., Ltd., and Mr.J.G.Reid the North Bay Canning Co., Ltd.

Mr. Mansergh briefly explained the object the Board had in view - that of a uniform close season for crawfish for the whole of the Western Coast of the Cape Province. The recommendation was that such a close season be from 15th May to 14th September. The Board would be glad to hear the views of the Canning Companies on the matter.

Mr.J.G.Reid stated that, apart from Port Nolloth, in regard to which Mr. Ovenstone would be more competent to express an opinion, he believed he was correct in saying that most canners were agreeable to the uniform close season as proposed by the Board.

Mr. Hickson said that the proposal would be satisfactory to the Cape Canners. From May to July it would be the means of saving all the young crawfish off Robben Island.

Mr.Ovenstone claimed that the condition of crawfish at Port Nolloth was totally different from that of crawfish further South. His Company had been operating at Port Nolloth since 1919. Their observations shewed that from the end of February to May and again in October ~~xxxx~~ the fish were soft. The proposed close season would be a serious handicap as from June to October the fish are in excellent condition. He considered the close season for Port Nolloth should be from 1st March to 30th June.

Mr. Stephan suggested that as Port Nolloth was so far north, it might be given a separate season. The present regulations were based on an acknowledgment of a difference in the seasons. At. Lambert's Bay the Board's proposal, which did not entirely fit in with the conditions there, would mean a great loss to the Canners, but they were prepared to make a concession in the interest of the industry.

Mr.A.H.Reid drew attention to the great disparity between the dates proposed by Mr. Ovenstone and those recommended by the Board.

Mr. Gilchrist stated that his investigations up to the present did not disclose any great difference between the condition of crawfish at Port Nolloth and the Cape. In both places the female was found to be soft in May and the male in October. His investigations were not however sufficiently advanced to make a definite pronouncement on the question as to whether Port Nolloth should conform to the close season proposed.

In reply to an inquiry from Mr. Mansergh all the representatives of the Canning Companies present expressed their agreement with a uniform close season for crawfish from Cape Point to the Southern limit of Hondeklip Bay from 15th May to 14th September, and stated that they had no objection to a separate close season from the Southern limit of Hondeklip Bay to the north bank of the Mouth of the Orange River from 1st March to 30th June.

After an expression of thanks by the Chairman on behalf of the Board, the ~~xxxx~~ representatives of the Canning Companies withdrew.

The Board then considered the position.

In reply to an inquiry from Mr. van Zyl, Dr. Gilchrist stated that the scientific data at present available were not sufficient to demand that the close season for Port Nolloth should be the same as for the rest of the Coast. It would not be possible to get such data before May next. In his opinion an immense advance in the direction of uniformity of close season had been made through the unanimity of the Canners in the main issue. Pending further investigations Port Nolloth might be allowed a separate close season.

After further ~~xxx~~ discussion the Board's resolution of the 28th September:-

"That after ~~April~~ April next a uniform close season of four consecutive months be imposed along the whole of the Western Coast of the Province."

was reconsidered and rescinded.

Mr. van Zyl moved and Mr.A.H.Reid seconded:-

"~~That~~ That there be a uniform close season for crawfish from Cape Point to the southern limit of Hondeklip Bay from 15th May to 14th September."

This was unanimously agreed to.

Mr. Stephan moved and Mr.A.H.Reid seconded:-

"That the close season for the area extending from the southern limit of Hondeklip Bay to the North Bank of the mouth of the Orange River be from 1st March to 30th June for the year 1921."

This was unanimously agreed to, it being understood that in the interim special investigations would be undertaken by Dr. Gilchrist with the object of ascertaining the condition of the fish in the closed area at various periods of the year, with a view to permit adjustment of the close season at a later date.

Mr. Mansergh intimated that it might be possible to arrange for the above alterations in the dates of the close seasons, if approved by the Executive , to appear in the OFFICIAL GAZETTE of the 15th October.

Secretary.

Confirmed

Chairman.

Minutes of Meeting of Fisheries Advisory Board, held at Huguenot Buildings on Thurdsay, the 3rd November, 1921.

Present: Mr. Mansergh (Chairman), Dr. Gilchrist, and Messrs. van Zyl, J.G.Reid, Irvin and Aling. The Secretary intimated that Mr. Runciman had phoned expressing his regret at not being able to be present. Expressions of regret were also received from Messrs. Stephan and Rawbone.

(1) Netting for Fish in Langebaan Bay.

At the Chairman's request, Mr. Aling gave some particulars of the result of his investigations as to conditions at Langebaan. Dr. Gilchrist was of opinion that the fish do not spawn in the lagoon. Mr. Reid agreed. The netting destroyed the young fry but not the ova. Both seine and set-netting should be prohibited in tidal estuaries in terms of a resolution passed by the Board in 1917. Of the two, set netting was the more harmful. Mr. Aling commented on the great cost of seine nets (up to £300 each) and the severe loss that would fall on seine netters if they were prohibited from using their nets. Mr. Irvin thought the time was inopportune for tightening up regulations. At Langebaan the whaling stations are closed at present. It would be better to see that the present regulations are observed and not allow set-netting.

Mr. van Zyl moved "That the existing regulations prohibiting the use of set-nets at Langebaan be maintained". Mr. Irvin seconded. Carried.

(2) Mr.Fleming's proposals for establishment of a floating factory for fish curing and canning

Mr. Mansergh pointed out that the establishment of a floating station in its aspect as a factory would not come under the Provincial Administration: its jurisdiction would only be involved in matters connected with the actual catching of fish, etc., as the function committed to the Provincial Council is the protection of fish. Mr. Reid directed attention to the defiling of fishing grounds which would ~~xxxxxxxxxxx~~ ensue by the discharging of refuse into the waters. No crawfish are found within 10 miles from any place where fish offal is dumped in quantity.

Mr. Irvin moved that "In the opinion of the Board the development of fishing industries should be encouraged with due regard to the existing rights, but that before floating stations are allowed to operate, strict regulations should be issued against the creation of conditions that would lead to the defiling of fishing grounds, and be detrimental to the fishing industry." Mr. Reid seconded. Carried.

(3) Mr.J.G.Reid's application for information in regard to the terms on which rights would be obtainable in respect to collecting shellfish at Langebaan.

Mr. Reid said that if a strip of the lagoon where fishing is not carried on could be obtained, the idea was to lay down and prepare oyster beds. This would probably take about 18 months. He hoped thereby to establish a valuable industry. In the meantime, however, it was necessary that permission should be obtained for the grantee of any area allowed for experimenting with oysters to collect live mussels over such area, and to preserve and otherwise deal with them.

It was pointed out that the right to give such a lease would rest with the Crown and would require the special sanction of Parliament.

Mr. Irvin moved that "As it is extremely desirable to encourage the opening up of an oyster industry, the Board is in favour of the grant of an area in the lagoon not exceeding 1½ miles in length by 1 mile to sea for the purpose of cultivating oysters, provided such grant does not entail hardship or damage to other fisheryx undertaking. Further the Board is of opinion that there should be no objection to live mussels being worked within such area whilst the propagation of the

the oysters as being undertaken by the concessionaire". Seconded by Dr. Gilchrist. Carried.

(4) Development of the South African Fishing Industry.

Mr. Duncan's suggestions in regard to the matter were read and noted.

(5) Reduced railway rates for the conveyance of canned snoek and other South African Fishing Products.

Mr. van Zyl moved that details be obtained from the Railway Administration in regard to the freight on ~~xxxxx~~ imported and South African canned and other fish and that statistics be obtained from the factories at Saldanha Bay and Mossel Bay as to the nature and extent of their output in these articles. Mr. Irvin seconded. Agreed to.

(6) Proposed Fertiliser Factory at Langebaan.

Mr. Irvin intimated that the applicants were carefully considering the position at the moment, and that no further action need be taken.

Confirmed
Louis Irvin
15.11.17
Chairman

J. W. MUNNIK.
Secretary.

Minutes of Meeting of Fisheries Advisory Board, held at the Huguenot Buildings on Tuesday, the 15th November, 1921.

Present: Mr. Mansergh (Chairman), Dr. Gilchrist, and Messrs. J.G.Reid, Rawbone, Stephan, Van Zyl, Dunn and Aling.

Mr. Mansergh extended a hearty welcome to Mr. Dunn on his first appearance at a meeting of the Board.

(1) Netting for fish in Langebaan Bay. Mr. Mansergh explained that since the last meeting of the Board Mr.J.G.Reid had paid a special visit to Langebaan Bay and had been so impressed with what he had seen that he had asked for a further meeting of the Board.

Mr. Reid stated that he had seen the places where the set net and seine net fishing take place. Set nets were employed in parts of the lagoon where the sea bottom is rocky. The grounds are entirely unsuitable for seine nets which would suffer immense damage from the rocks. In his opinion set netting was not deleterious to fish but it might affect the seine netters by preventing fish reaching them. The difficulty could possibly be overcome by preventing set netting within half a mile of seine netting grounds.

Dr. Gilchrist pointed out that the position at the moment is that complaints have been received from seine netters that set nets used near the seine net trekking grounds diverted the course of the fish and prevented them from entering the lagoon.

Major van Zyl wanted to know whether, if set nets were permitted in the lagoon the Provincial Administration could logically at any future date refuse their use elsewhere.

Dr. Gilchrist remarked that the crux of the whole matter is that as seine nets are at present protected along the open coast they should receive even greater protection in a lagoon. On the other hand if set nets are allowed in a lagoon there would, contrariwise, be all the more reason to allow them elsewhere. Such a departure would, however, demand a revision of the present policy in respect to the classes of nets recognized. He admitted that seine nets did not exact from the sea such a toll of its resources as would be possible with more up-to-date nets and, in this connection, instanced the position at Muizenberg.

Mr. Dunn pleaded strongly for encouraging the use of ~~set~~ nets with mesh of proper dimensions, so that immature fish could be saved. He saw nothing wrong with set nets, the use of which would probably ultimately cause the elimination of seine nets, which he considered desirable.

Mr. Mansergh pointed out that a very big question would be involved if in future the policy of the Board should be to aim at the disappearance of seine nets.

Major van Zyl moved that an investigation be made into the general question of netting in Provincial waters and that, in the meantime, set netting in Langebaan Bay be not interfered with, but that no additions to the existing number of such nets be allowed.

This was agreed to.

(2) Crayfish. Mr. Mansergh intimated that some local trouble had arisen through police prosecutions of fishermen in possession of undersized crayfish. The Italian fishermen had gone on strike. Representatives had called at the office of the Department to demand a reduction in the size limit from 4" to 3½". They also argued that there were two kinds of crayfish and that the size limit should be reduced to 3½" to permit capture of the smaller kind. He thought it might be helpful to the factory owners if the Board met the fishermen and heard their complaints.

Messrs Stephan and Reid considered that a four inch limit was absolutely essential.

Mr. Rawbone held that no useful purpose would be served by meeting the fishermen.

Major van Zyl moved that "The Board sees no reason to re-consider its previous resolution which had received careful consideration."

This was agreed to.

(3).....

(3) Exportation of Crawfish in bulk. Mr. Stephan stated that there were indications that an attempt might be made to export crayfish in bulk. The matter was in an experimental stage. Success would seriously affect the local industries.

Mr. Mansergh promised to obtain legal advice as to whether it would be possible to prohibit the exportation of crayfish in bulk.

Major van Zyl remarked that if such power did not exist it would be necessary to approach the Union Parliament for special legislation to meet the case.

Secretary

Confirmed
Chairman

Minutes of Meeting of Fisheries Advisory Board held at the Huguenot Buildings on Friday, the 28th July, 1922.

Present: Mr. Mansergh, Dr. Gilchrist, and Messrs J.G. and A.H.Reid, Garden and Aling.

The minutes of the previous meeting were confirmed.

Mr. Mansergh welcomed Mr. Garden, who made his first appearance as a member of the Board.

A letter was received from Mr. Runciman expressing his regret at being unable to be present.

(1) NETTING FOR FISH IN FALSE BAY.

Mr. Mansergh stated that a largely signed petition had been received from members of the fishing community at False Bay regarding the diversion of the course of fish in False Bay, and permission had been asked to allow Messrs Breda, Cotton and Pearce to make representations to the Board in the matter.

Mr. Breda, who was then admitted, accounted for the absence of Messrs. Cotton and Pearce by explaining that they had lately taken to set-netting.

Mr. Breda described at length the difficulties of the position and strongly urged the necessity of an imparted ial inquiry on the spot. Great natural changes had taken place along the coast of False Bay and bays that were once sandy have now become rocky. He pointed out that harders are a sensitive fish and easily scared and he emphasized the great harm done by chasing the fish, which often meant that a school of fish following in the wake of a school that had been scared would divert from its course and be lost. The chasing of the harder should be prohibited and fishermen should be compelled to go on the outside of the shoal - not between the shoal and the foreshore - so as not to prevent them from going to the shore.

Mr. Mansergh pointed out that provision already exists to meet such cases and that it appeared to be a matter which fell within the jurisdiction of the Magistrate. Mr. Breda remarked that the Magistrate was not prepared to convict on the regulation as it stood and suggested an amendment to the regulation prohibiting fishermen from chasing any shoal of fish after the fish had passed their operating grounds. Mr. Mansergh explained that such a regulation was drafted and submitted to the Department's legal adviser who was of opinion that the inclusion of the words suggested made the proposed regulation less wide than the regulation in force.

Mr. Breda then intimated that in the circumstances he would be again compelled to take legal proceedings in the matter.

After his withdrawal it was decided that the Board, having given full consideration to the matter, was not prepared to take any action to amend the present regulation.

PROTECTION OF SEA-BIRDS: DASSEN ISLAND.

PROTECTION OF SEA-BIRDS: DASSEN ISLAND.

In regard to the suggestion to include the use of all nets - except crayfish nets - within a radius of three miles from the Guano Islands, Mr. J. G. Reid commented on the fact that there was no machinery to enforce regulations and that sporadic attempts to do so merely upset people and were expensive.

As it is not clearly proved that penguins have actually been caught in nets off the Islands, the Board recommends that all landing on the Islands from the fishing boats be strictly prohibited and enforced, and that a sharp lookout be kept for any infringements and that full particulars be furnished to the Board when these do occur.

UNIFORM CLOSE SEASON FOR CRAYFISH ALONG WESTERN COAST OF PROVINCE.

In view of the fact that the S.W.A.Administration had imposed a close season similar to that prevailing in No.2 Area in the Cape, it was decided that that Administration should be asked on what data the imposition was made and also to furnish particulars in regard to periods when the fish are soft, in berry, and such other information as Dr. Gilchrist may desire.

NETTING IN BERG RIVER.

The proposed proclamation on the matter submitted under cover of the Provincial Secretary's letter of the 24th July 1922 was approved.

Secretary

Confirmed

Chairman